CHAPTER 4

FIRST PEOPLES, MUSEUMS AND CITIZENSHIP

DONNA McALEAR

Museums and anthropology argue for knowledge. Native peoples plead cultural need. (Tymchuk, 1985: 390).

INTRODUCTION

Museums worldwide have been identified by First Peoples as significant sites of political struggle in recent decades. I shall examine why and how the public museum, typically regarded as a politically-neutral and educative body, has been challenged by contemporary indigenous interests. These observations will place current indigenous concerns and actions within First Peoples' broader aspirations for self-determination: self-government and cultural restoration.

MUSEUMS, SCIENCE AND COLONISATION

In Australia, museums were constituted in the early to mid-nineteenth century following European models. They were principally concerned with the collection and study of natural history specimens. In 1838, a French visitor to the Australian Museum in Sydney observed a curious exhibition of native fauna and plaster-cast heads:

There I saw the numerous, peculiar animals of New Holland; the opossum; the Orny-thorynchus with its golden-green fur and changing shades of which they make magnificent trimmings; the kangaroo ... the recently discovered kangaroo mouse. In the anteroom ... I was shown a collection of plaster casts, taken from the faces of the biggest criminals in the colony, after they had been executed. These faces were all contracted and had a strained appearance ... (Strahan, 1979: 17).

This intermingling of unlikely objects personifies early museum displays whose antecedents were the eighteenth century cabinets of curiosities. However, the collection of phrenological face masks presages a growing interest in physical anthropology.

Early Australian museums maintained a focus on natural history for reasons other than the purely scientific. The settler society was founded on the principle of 'terra nullius', meaning, a land empty of people. This concept enabled the colonial government to annex

a new territory, free of the obligation of negotiating treaties with an existing population (Garton, 1989: 189).

Significantly, this precipitated drastic social consequences for Aborigines; deprived of land they were simultaneously divested of a human identity. 'Terra nullius' created a legal foundation

for the popularly-held scientific opinion that Aborigines occupied an earlier and lower rung on the evolutionary ladder, 'primitive' curiosities remote from civilised men.

The work of early museum custodians reflected the moral, intellectual and political ideas of the times, and so indigenous societies were generally discounted as a distinct arena of knowledge in museums where the natural sciences reigned supreme. Consequently, early ethnographic collections accumulated in haphazard, indiscriminate, and sometimes, very grim, ways. George Masters' collecting routines for the Australian Museum in 1864 epitomize early Victorian research priorities. While obtaining 'specimens of the newly discovered Queensland Lungfish' at Maryborough, [Masters] also happened to secure 'the preserved skin of a Black Gin' (Whitley, 1962: 112).

MUSEUMS AND ANTHROPOLOGY: THE SALVAGE PARADIGM

Paradoxically, Aboriginal culture was deemed historically worthy of study precisely at a juncture when it was believed to be near-extinct. The theory that First Peoples the world over were dying out was universally encouraged by intellectuals who used disparate theories that nonetheless resulted in a common refrain:

... the savage is disappearing; preserve what you can; posterity will hold you accountable (Gruber, 1970: 1295).

Anthropologists and archaeologists urgently adopted a salvage orientation in their quest for human origins. Indigenous peoples' material culture and human remains were collected, lifeways, languages and oral histories were analysed and recorded, and burial grounds and sacred sites were mapped and excavated. It was contended that the material evidence of 'primitive' races, who were thought to live eternally in 'the past', would collectively shed light on the true origins of 'civilised man'. Thus, during the 'museum age' of anthropology — 1880 to 1920 — a nascent anthropological profession established itself with commensurate authority in the natural history museum. Museums became central repositories for First Peoples' material culture gathered during private and government-sponsored expeditions.

Coupled with the growing eredibility of the anthropological profession and its promulgation of salvage concepts, the incentive for expanding collections in Australia can also be attributed to a new-found nationalism; material evidence of a near-extinct people was being lost to overseas museums. The Ethnological Committee of New South Wales, formed in 1902, declared its aim to be:

> The acquisition for the Australian Museum of Aboriginal artifacts for New South Wales, especially the western areas, 'before more of these valuable records of the early history of the Continent are further disseminated over the world and lost to the people of the State. (Specht, 1979: 143).

Such views were supported by various legislative measures implemented to afford degrees of export prohibition to Aboriginal relics and internal protection for Aboriginal archaeological sites, such as the Customs Act of 1901 and the Crown Lands Consolidation Act of 1913, respectively. Furthermore, with regards to the museum's civic education duties, the importance of Aboriginal culture to the education of 'every man and woman in the State, and even the children of tender years' was declared:

> Like other primitive races, our aborigines are fast disappearing before the inroads of civilization, and we feel sure that every Australian will welcome popular articles on our predecessors in this continent, their quaint customs and ceremonials. (Anderson, 1921: 3).

Governmental instruments of protection, museum preservation and popular education efforts indoctrinated the general populace with clear, yet conflicting, messages about Australia's original inhabitants. Citizens were encouraged to value the remnants of Aboriginal culture as 'national treasures'; a unique aspect of their own history. Aboriginal people were 'fast disappearing' because their 'primitive' ways were inherently unsuited to the advancement of civilisation. This belief absolved the dominant European society of any responsibility in the matter of their demise. Aboriginal people continued to be held in low regard because of their traditional lifeways, while the material evidence of their culture was increasingly worthy precisely because it signified the 'past'.

MUSEUMS: KEEPERS OF A COLONIAL LEGACY

First Peoples' relations with museums have been in conflict from the outset, principally due to the processes by which 'ethnographic' collections were amassed. Many European nineteenth century museums rapidly accumulated Aboriginal artefacts and remains as a result of military reconnaissances, geological surveys, road and railway expeditions, and urban, agricultural and industrial expansion. First Peoples were firstly divested of their land and then of their cultural heritage.

Museum collections continued to expand in the first half of the twentieth century through anthropological and archaeological expeditions based on assumptions of cultural salvage advocated by an increasingly heritage-conscious nationalism. Furthermore, assimilationist policies adopted by zealous missionaries and governments imposed Christian reform amongst indigenous populations now relocated onto well-policed reserve lands. In some cases ceremonial and religious materials were confiscated from communities and deposited in museums under the laws of Church and State. Prejudicial conditions of immense duress brought about by rapid cultural change in indigenous societies — poverty, eroding traditional links to earlier lifeways, and the dispersal of tribal and family groups, and removal for re-education of young children — also drove many First Peoples to willingly relinquish or sell cultural material previously used to maintain spiritual beliefs and ties to land and families.

Twentieth century museum representations of First Peoples changed little from earlier conceptions, despite the troubled and complex social transformations occurring in contemporary indigenous communities. In Australian museums, Aborigines continued to be contextualised within natural history descriptions, and their cultures were accorded a remote, static and near-extinct status well into the 1960s. The March 1957 issue of The Australian Museum Magazine indicates the biased state of knowledge available to Sydney museum-goers just forty years ago:

> There are ... more than half a million shells alone in the Museum collections. Thousands of birds, rock and mineral specimens and fossils from all geological ages fill row after row of cabinets. There is possibly a quarter of a million insects in the entomological section. Store rooms are filled with fishes, reptiles and marine animals of all sorts and also with specimens depicting the life of the fast disappearing Aborigines ... ' (1957: 156).

The twentieth century, for First Peoples, has been an epoch of erosion of family groups, possessions, spiritual beliefs, social customs and languages through successive governmental policies of elimination, protection and assimilation. The State museum, as the resting place for the fragmented remains of First Peoples' material culture, has inherited the symbolic legacy of this tumultuous and disruptive time. Its collections have come to simultaneously represent, perhaps ironi-

cally, both the stigma of First Peoples' loss, and, at this century's end, the more powerful spirit of First Peoples' survival.

FIRST PEOPLES AND POLITICAL WILL

Recent interactions of First Peoples and museums have emerged as part of a much broader and complex series of political independence movements world-wide. Indigenous nationalist movements occurred with regularity in the post-1945 years in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean where oppressed populations fought to remove colonial powers. These early manifestations of decolonisation on the world stage spurred the growth of post-1960s pan-aboriginal and grass-roots politics in 70 countries where indigenous peoples account for 4% of the global population. The World Council of Indigenous Peoples, founded in 1975, has mapped over 1,000 indigenous organisations, most founded during the past 20 years (Burger, 1990).

Today, First Peoples' fortitude to reassert language, religion and social custom is coequal to self-determination. A brief consideration of the developments and pursuit of such goals by First Nations in Canada will offer some useful comparative insights into the strategies for achieving cultural self-determination being pursued in Australia.

Canada's First Nations — Indian, Inuit and Métis — lived under the Indian Act first passed in 1876. Consequently, they were progressively subjected to racist legislative controls that not only established reservation lands but also determined land access and use, dictated education, regulated peoples' movements on and off reservations, and prohibited cultural ceremonies and entertainments. Canadian indigenous policies of assimilation and acculturation actions persisted well into the 1960s. Nevertheless, many visionary First Nations cultural projects and social programs have emerged since then, including: the Society of Canadian Artists of Native Ancestry; the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation; the Metis Association of Alberta; Ojibway Tribal Family Services; and the National Committee of Indian Cultural Educational Centres which represents 70 centres of various sizes across Canada. Political organisations, such as the Assembly of First Nations, the Metis National Council, the Inuit Tapirisat, and the Native Council of Canada, recently negotiated at federal constitutional talks leading up to the Charlottetown Accord in 1992, something previously denied them. Political will and action have gained First Nations greater

prominence and respect in the dominant political and media arenas. Yet, the struggle for self-government and cultural survival remain ultimate objectives.

Many First Nations believe, like Richard Atleo, that

> injustices of the past which can be corrected today are worth correcting simply because it is the right thing to do (Atleo, 1991: 59).

First Peoples promote the moral right to self-government and the ownership of land, cultural property, and religious and social customs that eclipse existing nation-state legislative frameworks historically imposed by colonialism. Importantly, they point out, in countries like Australia and Canada, government policies of multiculturalism and human rights codes that advance equality and respect for the public celebration of the cultural differences of migrant populations, often preclude a recognition of First Peoples' distinctive cultures. Mary Jamieson expresses the key differences between multicultural and indigenous views of cultural maintenance when she states:

> The Aboriginal cultures of Canada have no other homeland. If they do not survive in this country, there is no opportunity for renewal elsewhere. (Jamieson, 1989: 4).

Canadian indigenous projects find counterparts in Australian cultural initiatives, such as: the Boomalli Aboriginal Artists Co-operative; the Koorie Oral History Program; the Koorie Heritage Trust; and the Queensland Indigenous Committee for Visual Arts. Prominent social and political organisations include: the National Organisation of Aboriginal and Islander Legal Services; the Aboriginal Provisional Government; the Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action; and the Aboriginal Medical Services Co-operative.

Collectively, these endeavours have increased social awareness that First Peoples' aspirations for self-determination simply mean — the freedom to control their own lives in negotiated areas. Likewise, international bodies, such as the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, and other pro-indigenous coalitions like Survival International in the UK, supply platforms for global advocacy. Geoff Clarke, speaking at a meeting of the National Coalition of Aboriginal Organisations of Australia in 1988, had this to say to non-indigenous participants:

> We define our rights in terms of self-determination. We are not looking to dismember your States and you know it. But we do insist on the right to control our territory, our resources, the organization of our societies, our own decision-making institutions, and the

maintenance of our own cultures and ways of life. (Burger, 1990: 140).

Contemporary society is more accepting and knowledgeable about indigenous rights than past generations, but for many, change is an unsettling prospect. In Australia, it took the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (1987-1990), Aboriginal protests leading up to and during the Australian Bicentennary celebrations (1988), and the recent 'Mabo Case' (1982-1992), to highlight the persistence of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social inequities and injustices. Likewise, in Canada, the trauma of the 1990 Mohawk armed resistance at Kanehsatake (Oka) and Kahnawake over Native rights to protect a burial ground from commercial development revealed the urgency of First Nations claims to the majority of Canadians.

The increasing resistance of First Peoples to dominant government policies and their progressive political organisation has generated hope for future reconciliation. The 1990s have surfaced as a time of earnest governmental negotiation with First Peoples, and prospects of social reform and the restitution of past wrongs signal major paradigm shifts at a public policy level.

Canadian Dene and Inuit have settled comprehensive land claims, including the *Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Act 1992* and the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement Act 1993*, which includes the *Nunavut Act* to establish the territory of Nunavut. This new body of legislation includes references to First Nations and government sharing responsibility for the protection and management of cultural heritage resources (Snow, 1993). In Australia, the 'Mabo Case' (1982-1992) resulted in the High Court of Australia overturning the doctrine of 'Terra Nullius' with specific respect to the Meriam people of the Murray Islands (FAIRA, 1992). While the impact of the High Court's decision on land claims Australia-wide has yet to be fully understood, the 'Mabo' decision greatly influenced the Labor government's intensive consultation and negotiation with Aboriginal leaders towards the rapid passage of the *Native Title Act 1993*.

When viewed within this broader political context, it is clear that demands made on museums by indigenous groups today emphasise social justice and cultural restitution. First Peoples request an acknowledgment of past wrongs and wish to engender awareness of their contemporary reality. Through social justice they work to counter racism, and through cultural restitution they revitalise their heritage and generate public

awareness and appreciation for cultural differences. It is the opinion of most museum professionals and indigenous groups that the museum can be a contributing resource and location for such activities if First Peoples proposals for access and equity in the conceptualisation of museum policies and programs, and the control and ownership of cultural property, are respected and enabled.

This chapter examines a range of museum and government policy experiments in Australia and Canada. To place matters in their appropriate perspective we look first at indigenous viewpoints in respect of cultural heritage. For indigenous peoples, gaining control of their own heritage resources is key to cultural survival. A consideration of this perspective will provide a context from which to review and assess the adequacy of the changing policies and practices through which museums have responded to First Peoples' aspirations to control their heritage resources.

FIRST PEOPLES' ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES

Native Americans ... have ... a strange and special link with museums that has been described as a love/hate relationship. Many Indians appreciate the fact that for many reasons, the material that has survived is to be found in museums, where it is preserved and researched. The hate aspect comes from the fact that these museums are usually far away from Indian homes, and the materials are hence inaccessible to them. So the Indian people went to the museums searching for ways to restore their culture. For the most part, they were viewed with suspicion or treated with outright hostility. (George P. Horse Capture, 1991: 50-51).

The Issue is control. You seek to say that as scientists you have a right to obtain and study information of our culture. You seek to say that because you are Australians you have a right to study and explore our heritage because it is a heritage to be shared by all Australians, white and black. From our point of view we say — you have come as invaders, you have tried to destroy our culture, you have built your fortunes upon the lands and bodies of our people and now, having said sorry, want a share in picking out the bones of what you regard as a dead past. We say that it is our past, our culture and heritage and forms part of our present life. As such it is ours to control and it is ours to share on our terms. (Langford, 1983: 5).

FIRST PEOPLES' PERSPECTIVES

George P. Horse Capture's description of a love/hate relationship between museums and First Peoples is apt. Today, museums, precisely because of past preservation activities, cannot be avoided by First Peoples intent upon cultural restoration. Indeed, for First Peoples, museums have become significant sites of political struggle for control of their cultural heritage. Conversely,

museums have traditionally perceived themselves as politically-neutral institutions whose safeguarding of objects and dissemination of knowledge holds universal social benefit. A consequence of such disparate histories and differing cultural assumptions is that present-day associations between museums and First Peoples are prone to tension.

The basic source of this political disjunction is articulated by a First Nations educator who remarks that

> the *concept* of a museum of anthropology is the creation of the dominant White society, but the *content* of the museum is the creation of the dominated Native peoples (Ames, 1990: 159).

Speaking about the Canadian experience, Michael Ames argues that the disharmony between western and First Nations worldviews is illustrated in a series of primary distinctions operative in the museum, between intellectual constructions of art and artefact, past and present, and politics and culture.

According to Ames, where museums foster oppositional understandings between art and artefacts according to western frameworks of aesthetic and anthropological theory, First Nations see objects 'as beautiful, practical and spiritual all at the same time'. So, the museum's 'tendency to focus on only some of these values to the exclusion of others diminishes the original holistic or multiplex meaning' of indigenous cultural material. Museums locate objects in the past, separating them from the present, but First Nations 'give more importance to continuities between past and present and to their continuing presence in contemporary society'.

A Native American holistic cultural perspective is elucidated by Rick Hill, former Assistant Director for Public Programs of the National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution:

> There is an Indian way of thinking about the world. We believe living things are spiritual beings whose well-being depends upon the well-being of the plants, waters, air, animals, celestial bodies and spiritual forces that inhabit the Indian world. Spiritual law, artistic excellence and particular ways of thinking are very important elements in our daily life. We do not isolate art, religion or culture as activities we only do one day each week or only in particular places. ... All of this and much more are carried forward due mainly to the family relationships in Indian societies. Family is the primary means by which Indian art, culture and religion are maintained. (Hill, 1993: 7-8).

Ames and Hill clarify that radically opposite cultural assumptions determine how divergent concepts of 'heritage' operate in western and indigenous communities. This clash of distinctive

worldviews underscores the potential for tensions between them. Western museum visitors — including women and ethnic groups — have been educated to isolate the past from their daily lives. Traditionally, the museum has functioned as a temple to celebrate historical achievements — political, industrial, artistic or scientific — by and for the nation-state. And, when family heirlooms or collections are deposited into museum collections — either by sale or donation — this is achieved through the freewill and consent of the donor.

Contrarily, First Peoples have not, in the main, experienced this luxury of choice. As we have seen, much cultural material was simply taken; more was sold to ward off starvation and illness. A phrase, often repeated by indigenous activists, 'My Grandfather is not an artifact' (Dunn, 1991), succinctly emphasises First Peoples' living and family links to cultural material. But, it also stresses a political resistance to museum traditions that separate 'artefacts' from people. Such action ultimately denies First Peoples their distinctive worldviews, identities, and rights to participate in their own culture, because, housed within the museum culture, an 'artefact', by virtue of its location and meaning, becomes someone else's 'heritage'.

In seeking retribution for mistaken or missing narratives of their past, and a recognition for their human rights as citizens, First Peoples battle ongoing marginalisation and oppression by the dominant culture whose worldview they do not share. Heritage, for First Peoples, is not simply a nostalgic or analytic glimpse at historical and institutional record. Heritage is commensurate with cultural survival. Thus, First Peoples' perceptions and dealings with museums always rest unabashedly on political ground.

FIRST PEOPLES' CULTURAL SURVIVAL AND CONTROL

Cultural survival is not simply a heritage matter for First Peoples, but is a central component of all sociopolitical agency. Tom Owlijoot of the Inuit Cultural Institute says:

> It's hard to make distinctions between heritage and culture from our point of view. We're concerned that people continue to practice and value their culture ... (Brockman, 1989: 22).

The preservation, protection and national value of First Peoples' cultural heritage has been an escalating concern of museum personnel, government bodies and indigenous peoples, albeit, for very different reasons. Legislative reforms and museum initiatives of the past two

decades indicate a heightened recognition of First Peoples' moral rights to their cultural heritage. This new awareness is principally due to First Peoples' political actions and increasing assertion of their distinctive worldviews. Yet, despite significant reforms and agreements to consult with indigenous communities on cultural heritage matters, many First Peoples believe western paradigms remain largely intact, unaltered, and consequently, continue to disempower.

Henrietta Fourmile (1987, 1989, 1990), points out that vestiges of colonialism remain entrenched in the principle of Crown ownership that directs legislation, while scientific concepts and terminologies still frame museum policies and exhibition interpretations of others. Similarly, Fincina Hopgood expresses a view shared by indigenous groups world-wide when she states:

> Many Koories still believe that Aboriginal self-management can never be fully realised until they have complete ownership, control and representation so that they may protect their own heritage without an intermediary bureaucratic body. (Hopgood, 1990: 114-116).

Throughout the 1980s, First Peoples challenged the hierarchy and ideology of western cultural institutions. Rick Hill asks:

> Does the public have a right to know all, to see that which another culture considers too sacred to show, to possess another's cultural/spiritual legacy? (Hill, 1988: 33).

Such pointed questions, and the reforms they have instigated, have now led First Peoples, as Ros Langford (1983) forcefully predicted, to the salient issue of the 1990s — control. Museum personnel who have addressed the interests of First Peoples in museum collections and dealt with cultural patrimony claims over the past decade have come to realise, like Chris Anderson of the South Australian Museum, that

> repatriation is no longer the issue. The issue is one of control and of empowering the relevant groups to work in a cooperative fashion (Anderson, 1992: 4).

First Peoples' demands for greater controls over cultural heritage matters have been considered in government policy since the 1970s. A brief consideration of selected Commonwealth and State reports illustrate how governments have successively understood and analysed indigenous needs for cultural and political autonomy.

THE AUSTRALIAN POLICY CONTEXT

A stream of Commonwealth reports address Aboriginal cultural heritage issues within overarching national heritage agendas since the mid-1970s. The political climate of Whitlam's Labor government directed much of the legislative and social policy reform in place today. Amongst

these was the national review of museums in Australia, (*Museums in Australia*, 1975). This Commonwealth review was followed by State initiatives, such as *Museum Policy and Development in South Australia* (Edwards, 1981), whose recommendations were largely implemented. Such reports have advocated increased Aboriginal contributions to the nation-state through new facilities, improved care and conservation of ethnographic collections, and exhibition development with Aboriginal participation.

POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE

The Preservation of Australia's Aboriginal Heritage: Report of National Seminar on Aboriginal Antiquities in Australia, May 1972. This seminar was particularly concerned with the technical, administrative and legislative issues involved in preservation and future protection of the material culture and pre-historic archaeological evidence of Aboriginal heritage, such as rock art sites, rock engravings, natural land forms and material culture held in cultural institutions. It focussed on museum and government intervention and improvements to protect Aboriginal heritage from damage, disrespect and decay. Aboriginal interests are frequently noted, especially in respect of sensitive subjects and sacred sites. Aborigines participated in the seminar, and although in the minority, made a clear statement about Aboriginal aspirations and contributions to cultural maintenance and control:

> We ask that in areas where our people survive and maintain our traditional identity with the land, Aboriginal people be consulted about development projects ... in time to express ideas about whether these should be allowed or where they should be allowed. We are especially worried about places of special sacred importance to us and that our people he helped to map these places so that they can be given protection by law as a matter of urgency. We also ask that Aborigines be appointed as guardians or rangers for these sites under law. (Edwards, 1975: 117).

The seminar cast a critical eye on current problems and made succinct recommendations on a wide range of protection issues that federal and state governments need urgently address, including: improved legislation; the administration of legislative regulations; site recording; cultural tourism; Aboriginal involvement; mining and conservation; and the conservation of antiquities.

Museums in Australia 1975. Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Museums and National Collections including the Report of the Planning

Committee on the Gallery of Aboriginal Australia, Canberra 1975.

> The contemporary resurgence of interest in encouraging and recording traditional technology, decorative arts, song and dance, has stimulated a greater Aboriginal confidence in the old traditions, and a realisation that there were many differences between groups throughout Australia in their ceremonial and artistic life ... Knowledge of the wider Aboriginal community and a sense of pride in its achievements are paralleled in urban communities. Aboriginal people in city environments are turning to modern forms of theatre and other creative arts, to express their alienation and to focus upon the social pressures and deprivations of their people ... This social statement ... is part of contemporary Aboriginal life and could find its place in Gallery activities which encourage pride in a peoples' past and a sense of common identity ... The Gallery [of Aboriginal Australia] should become ... the symbol of the revival of traditional ways and a centre where the customs, arts and crafts of different regional groups can be created, displayed, examined and preserved. (Museums in Australia, 1975: 21, 24).

Commonly called the Pigott Report, this provided a much-needed survey of the Australian museum community, its development, resources, shortcomings and future needs. Whereas the report's recommendation to establish a national Museum of Australia was realised by an Act of Parliament in 1980, the museum complex envisioned to house the national collections and the proposed Gallery of Aboriginal Australia has not yet been fulfilled. However, the report, especially its suggestion to establish a Gallery of Aboriginal Australia, did bring to national attention the need to recognise the contributions of Aboriginal Australians within the heritage of the nation.

In 1975, the Committee observed the importance of training Aboriginal conservators within the Gallery, and also as future advisors to local community repositories, such as museum-storehouses, fast-becoming 'new elements in Aboriginal community life' (1975: 16). The national museum's role — as well as that of State museums — in supporting the development of local community museums through advice and training for Aboriginal peoples is stressed. Equally, the report suggests that local expertise of craftsmen and artists could assist in museum collection restoration programs. The report acknowledges that Gallery policy must take account of the inappropriateness of displaying religious objects in respect of Aboriginal views, and further recommends the implementation of restricted access storage areas where necessary.

Consultation with local communities was deemed necessary to educate Aboriginal peoples about positive aspects of museum traditions and current intentions. Their involvement in the museum, however, was primarily envisioned to include craft or performance demonstrations, and the commissioning of projects to communities to expand collections (for the museum and community to share), and regenerate traditional skills and education locally. It was proposed that meaningful relations between local communities and the national culture could be developed by instigating various programs, such as: limited access storerooms for religious materials; short-term loans of replicas to local communities; a Gallery visitation program for Aborigines to study collections to revitalise traditional ways; advice to custodians of local museums. Lastly, the training of Aboriginal museum specialists for future employment at the Gallery was deemed essential to the future of the institution and participation of the Aboriginal community.

Preserving Indigenous Cultures: A New Role for Museums. Adelaide, September 1978.

> The Seminar recognised the right of indigenous people to pursue their own traditional life-style by retaining and developing their own cultural traditions. It was further recognised that the most dynamic force in the preservation of cultures was the influence of the knowledgeable custodians who hold the respect of their people and continue to live the traditions. The meeting came to the conclusion that museums should strongly reinforce the role of custodians by giving priority to those activities which enable them to practise their culture without restriction or interference. (Edwards & Stewart (eds)1980: 9).

This seminar was a catalyst in generating awareness of First Peoples' rights in cultural heritage. It involved indigenous and non-indigenous participants from the Pacific, North America, Africa and New Zealand. Topics for discussion included: the role of indigenous people in preserving their heritage; the role of governments; the training needs of indigenous peoples; the role of local community cultural centres; the effect of commercial development on local communities; and the role of museums as educators, conservers and preservers of cultural property.

Speakers reported on museum and First Peoples' cultural heritage initiatives, including: a diversity of indigenous community cultural projects; government repatriation projects in Canada and New Zealand; and the need for education and training programs for indigenous peoples. A series of detailed seminar recommendations for the reform of museum and government operations, and policies and legislation in the South Pacific nations and Australia supports the UNESCO Recommendation con-

cerning The Most Effective Means of Rendering Museums Accessible to Everyone.

Report of New South Wales Ministerial Task Force on Aboriginal Heritage and Culture, New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service, 1989. The Task Force was jointly announced in January 1988 by the (then) Labor government's Ministry for Planning and Environment and Ministry for Aboriginal Affairs. Comprised of ten Aboriginal members, including William Jonas as chairperson, the Task Force was charged with reviewing current legislation (*The NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974*) and its administrative mechanisms, with special attention to its protection and management of Aboriginal heritage and culture.

A primary concern of the Task Force was to broaden the limited meaning of the term 'heritage', as it is used in most legislation to refer to a static past. Members stressed that for Aboriginal peoples, heritage and culture are inseparable and inclusive of not only objects and sites, but also language, oral history, dance, music and relations of people to land. The Task Force recognised the need for full and proper consultation with Aboriginal communities throughout New South Wales and adopted a variety of public relations, public meetings, draft reports, and extensive community consultation procedures to fulfill this objective.

Whereas current legislation made provisions for an Aboriginal Relics Advisory Committee, Aboriginal membership was not regulated within the law. The Task Force recommended that new legislation be adopted in order that Aboriginal heritage and culture be removed from under the umbrella of the current Act which traditionally provided for the protection of flora and fauna. The new law would be administered by the Minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs (and not Parks and Wildlife) through an elected Aboriginal Heritage Commission (comprised of state-wide Aboriginal representatives) as governing body.

The proposed legislation is based on a set of principles that recognise Aboriginal peoples' inherent rights to their own heritage and culture. These acknowledge Aboriginal ownership and insist on the statutory provision of local Aboriginal involvement in the decision-making, protection and management of all sites and heritage items. Major alterations to the language of the act are suggested to eliminate antiquated and deprecatory terms such as 'relics', in favour of dynamic terms that recognise Aboriginal belief in a continuity of heritage and culture. The proposed legislation includes: provisions for the protection and reburial of Aboriginal skeletal remains; Aboriginal access to sites; the institution of permit systems for researchers; and hunting, fishing and gathering rights for Aboriginal owners.

Consultation with Aboriginal People About Aboriginal Heritage: Report to the Australian Heritage Commission. Canberra 1989, and revised and updated report 1991. The Australian Heritage Commission was established in 1976. One of its main tasks is maintenance of a Register of the National Estate which records components of the natural or cultural environment of Australia that have aesthetic, historic, scientific, social significance or other special value for Australians. The AHC lists National Estate sites under three broad categories: natural environment, historic environment, and Aboriginal environment. Additions to the Register of the National Estate are nominated by the public.

The Aboriginal environment category has unique concerns. AHC staff noted as early as 1977 that few sites were nominated in this category. In 1985, AHC Commissioner, Isabel McBryde, noted 'the need for advice from Aboriginal perspectives on the Aboriginal component of the National Estate', particularly with regard to 'the nomination of places to the Register and their listing' (Jonas, 1991: ix). McBryde's concern resulted in the appointment of William Jonas in 1987 to review how the AHC could achieve nominations from Aboriginal people, and to make recommendations for improved AHC mechanisms for Aboriginal consultation.

Jonas discusses why Aboriginal peoples were not nominating sites to the Register of the National Estate with the same frequency as their Euro-Australian counterparts. He found that the concept of a centralised 'heritage' register and the nomination process do not hold the same categorical value for Aboriginal communities as for western ones. Many Aboriginal peoples, especially those in remote areas, were totally unaware of the AHC program. Aboriginal peoples were reluctant to nominate sacred sites to the register, as their secrecy would then be nullified. Finally, if and when Aboriginal peoples did engage the AHC process, it was when land areas and particular sites were under direct threat from mining or pastoral development.

Jonas' report notes that past AHC operations and procedures inhibited Aboriginal involvement. He stresses that revised and increased publicity directed to Aboriginal communities

together with greater Aboriginal consultation and participation is required by the AHC to increase Aboriginal environment nominations. By 1991, these mechanisms had largely been put into place.

Australian Aboriginal Affairs Council Task Force on the Return of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Property to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ownership. Canberra; ATSIC, 1990. The Australian Aboriginal Affairs Council (AAAC), which comprises Commonwealth, State and Territory government ministers responsible for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affairs, passed a resolution in February 1990 to establish a Task Force to develop national policy recommendations on the return of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural property.

Initially construed to initiate policy on the return of cultural property from overseas museums, particularly skeletal remains, the AAAC Task Force shifted towards developing a broader national policy inclusive of both Australian and overseas institutions and a broader definition of cultural property. The intention of the policy is that its resolutions and principles be accepted by the Commonwealth and all State governments.

Into the Twenty-First Century: Recommendations of the State Task Force for Museums Policy. Western Australian Department for the Arts, 1992. The Task Force was appointed by the Minister for the Arts to review the mandates, roles and practices of the Western Australian Museum and other regional, community and specialist museums throughout the State. The aim of this assessment was to make a series of recommendations concerning: relationships between the State museum and other museums; future directions for museum development and services during the next ten years; the government's role in facilitating this development.

The Task Force recommended sweeping legislative and administrative restructuring in the way the State's cultural bodies and services are governed, organised and delivered. The new superstructure proposed the establishment of three distinct but correspondent statutory authorities to superintend various functions of a State cultural complex. These are: the Western Australian Institute of Natural Sciences (reporting to the Minister for the Environment); the Western Australian Museums Commission (reporting to the Minister for the Arts); and the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Commission (reporting to the

Minister for the Arts and/or Heritage and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs).

An example of how traditional museum practices will be profoundly transformed if the new proposals are implemented is provided by the Task Force statement regarding the future of anthropology in Western Australia, which explains that:

> The Task Force ... is of the view that the current Department of Anthropology should not be joined to the proposed Institute of Natural Sciences, but rather should be closed down altogether and its collections (90% of which pertain to Aboriginal peoples) be subject to the administration of the proposed Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Commission ... (1992: 23).

The Task Force's Aboriginal Working Group advised that the current museum and heritage infrastructure in Western Australia disempowers Aboriginal people in areas of training and employment. Similarly, a fragmented approach to Aboriginal heritage management prevails. Aboriginal cultural heritage is very broadly defined by the Working Party to include 'movable and immovable, tangible and intangible, arts, language and living heritage of Aboriginal Western Australia' (*ibid*: 54). As such, it is recommended that existing heritage bodies be restructured into an integrated Aboriginal Heritage Commission. The proposed Aboriginal Heritage Commission would coordinate such activities within a single administrative unit under a series of guiding principles that:

1, recognise indigenous rights and the primary role of Aboriginal people in the preservation and management of their cultural heritage; and

2, support integrated, holistic and community-centred approaches to the management of Aboriginal heritage.

The Task Force recommendations require a major restructuring of government departments and a number of legislative reforms. The Aboriginal Heritage Commission and its Board of Commissioners (fifteen elected Aboriginal members) is meant to maintain Aboriginal community direction and 'ensure equitable Aboriginal participation at all levels of the Commission's activities' (*ibid*: 56). Aboriginal involvement, particularly at a community level, is encouraged through various methods, such as: the establishment of a Regional Community Cultural Centres network to reflect Western Australian Aboriginal cultural diversity; a Professional Development Programme open to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples for innovative and integrated training; policies to guide relationships between consultants and com-

munities; and validating the role of community in joint decision-making.

ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE AND GOVERNMENT: A THEMATIC OVERVIEW

This very selective survey indicates that Aboriginal cultural heritage has long been defined, governed and managed by fragmented, diverse and rotating government divisions. Ministries of the Environment, Parks and Wildlife, Arts, or Tourism have each defined (often simultaneously) how and where diverse aspects of Aboriginal culture are to be located, and how they are to be understood, treated, protected and enjoyed by the wider society.

Likewise, over the past twenty years, a discernible change is evident in the dominant discourse on Aboriginal cultural heritage. Early reports of the 1970s emphasise the protection, preservation and conservation of Aboriginal 'relics' and 'antiquities'. Such terms indicate a lack of concern for its current relevance to Aboriginal peoples in favour of scientific terminology.

While early reports do engage Aboriginal involvement — either as conference participants or committee members — the benefits of heritage protection and conservation for Aboriginal peoples are often cited as potential avenues for community tourism development, or for the regeneration of traditional lifeways. Again, the emphasis on enduring traditions, in view of tourism development, begs the question: 'Who is the preservation and conservation actually for — Aboriginal people or the museums and national parks of Australia?'

Reports of the 1980s and 1990s verify a shift in language that clearly signals a change in social attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples, particularly a recognition of their moral and legal rights. Scientific terms like 'relics' and 'preservation' have been transposed with statutory definitions of Aboriginal heritage. 'Cultural property' stresses the rights of ownership for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples themselves. And contemporaneous and inclusive terms such as 'cultural heritage' mark the continuity of past and present as understood from Aboriginal perspectives. These changes are partially due to Aboriginal peoples' increasing and consistent involvement on governmental review panels and advisory bodies.

There has been increased public awareness of Aboriginal cultural heritage in both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities. The early reports listed above would have been most influential here. However, in the main, they have effected legislative reform, the reorganisation of heritage bureaucracies, and museum development (new or refurbished buildings, conservation programs, redeveloped exhibitions and storage). Conversely, with regard to matters that concern Aboriginal peoples most directly, such as training and employment, the last significant training and employment influx (with the exception of the Museum of Victoria and the South Australian Museum), occurred in the early 1980s.

This raises a more general point. Policy recommendations for increased Aboriginal involvement at all levels, whether in mainstream museums or local communities, are being repeated with such consistency that one must consider why this is the case. While the policies and guiding principles may be well-intended, the mechanisms and resources required for widespread implementation are inadequate. As a result, change, while it does occur, is slow.

The government examples cited earlier indicate that heritage and museum policy reports are characterised by an examination of past sociopolitical attitudes to the institution and cultural issues under review. Accomplishments are summarised and shortcomings reported within the context of current social values and government agendas. In view of these data, reports propose a course of action — usually in the form of a set of principles. These principles guide any explicit recommendations for action that are necessary to move the institution towards the proposed visionary goal.

However, whether or not recommendations are implemented depends not only upon the will and motivation of the institution under review but also upon an institution's governing authorities. These may include the institution's immediate supervisory structure — its board of trustees — as well as, the overarching government body — municipal, state, or federal departments — and any legislative mechanisms. Collectively, these superstructures direct the institution's mandate, and regulate its financial and human resources.

In any discussion of institutional policy reform, it is worth keeping in mind that such governing authorities do have an impact on how an institution may or may not respond to policy reports and recommendations. The well-intentioned and (at the time) progressive *Museums in Australia 1975* is an exemple of a proposal that has yet to be fully realised due to a lack of complete financial commitment on the part of the federal government. We have yet to know what the impact of governmental power shifts will be on the two

most innovative and advanced reports noted above, the *Report of New South Wales Ministerial Task Force on Aboriginal Heritage and Culture*, and *Into the Twenty-first Century*. Both New South Wales and Western Australia have experienced a change of government since these undertakings.

CHANGING PRACTICES

> To really understand the story of the Indian, you must hear it from Indians. (Ernest Mike, Beardy-Okemasis Band, Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, cited in Karpan, 1989: 21)

The previous section pointed out that for over twenty years policy reports have consistently recommended increased participation of First Peoples at every level of cultural heritage planning, management and programming. It also suggested, that, in the main, implementation of these recommendations has been slow. This has been partly due to the time required to transform the internal culture of heritage institutions and partly to the slow injection of the financial and human resources needed to generate wide-ranging alternatives.

First Peoples' increased vocalisation of their perspectives has concurred with successive policy reports in suggesting that indigenous participation is the key to real change. This section examines First Peoples' views on precisely where and how institutional practice might be transformed.

REPRESENTATION

> Indians are not supposed to have a history. They are supposed to *be* history. ... History 'writes in' Indian peoples only at the points where they mesh with the story of the non-Indian past — with the fur trade, the Riel Rebellion, the white settlement of the west. This process has relegated Indian people to a place that is outside their own histories and given them little or no ability to influence what is being said about themselves. (Doxtator, 1992: 25).

Deborah Doxtator (1992) observed that the residue of racist historical stereotypes of what it means to be an 'Indian' make it very difficult for First Peoples to become involved or accepted in heritage or museum cultures. Rick Hill agrees, stating that one of the reasons museums do not involve First Peoples is because they may believe that 'Indians can't take care of themselves' so 'they can't care for collections' (Hill, 1988: 32). Given the strength of prevailing western myths, the transition for First Peoples to begin to represent themselves through all manner of cultural projects is vast and daunting. Vine Deloria Jr observes that as First Peoples begin to rewrite their stories, they do so with the full realisation

that the beliefs of the previous century, 'demeaning to American Indians', remain widely accessible to all students today. Thus, First Peoples are 'stuck with these writings' and 'old attitudes and stereotypes are perpetuated even in spite of our best efforts' (Deloria, 1992: 598). Deloria proposes that both indigenous and non-indigenous scholars must 'rework and restate ... terms of language that eliminate cultural bias' (Deloria, 1992).

There are strong indications that Deloria's proposals are indeed happening as more First Peoples infiltrate the cultural system and mediate historical archetypes. Likewise, new ways of writing about post-contact history have evolved as historians and anthropologists eschew grand narratives in favour of community histories which involve indigenous peoples. *Life Lived Like A Story: Life Stories of Three Yukon Native Elders*, by Julie Cruikshank in collaboration with Angela Sidney, Kitty Smith, & Annie Ned (1990) is once such example, as is the South Australian Museum's *Family History Project* (Kartinyeri, 1990).

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND APPROPRIATION:
A CYCLE OF MISREPRESENTATION

> You people love your story of us so much that you spend money on mystical Cherokee crystals, courses on shamanism, and trips to the Hopi Holy Land. (Durham & Fisher, 1988:104).

First Peoples' demands for greater representation have gained them a more visible presence in mass communications networks and cultural institutions. The 1980s and 1990s environmental movements, return to spirituality movements, and global cultural tourism developments, have generated a mass market for indigenous cultural products and information. A multitude of contemporary images and symbols of First Peoples enjoy a wider circulation in the media and greater presence in museums and art galleries (Figs 1, 4). Their popularity has meant that First Peoples, paradoxically, now struggle against cultural appropriation by non-indigenous producers who wish to tap into economic markets or reappraise their own creativity and spirituality through alternative models.

Appropriation is a traditionally accepted device of western culture, as shown by the art historical icons of early modernism (Picasso) to the more ironic and irreverent postmodern strategists (Koons). Whether cultural appropriation is intended to valorise, parody or denigrate, it poses special problems for indigenous artists, for it is largely in this arena that they are able to assert

FIG. 1. *Rock art pot* (1990) by Aboriginal Islander artist, Jenuarrie. Collection: Queensland Art Gallery. (Photo courtesy of the Queensland Art Gallery).

and validate their own cultural differences as distinct from that of the dominant culture.

Robert Houle (1991), First Nations artist, explains that artmaking is both a subjective and political action for indigenous artists. It involves developing a new language wherein indigenous knowledge is used to contest past misrepresentations of one's subjectivity while simultaneously constructing and transposing a new subjectivity. If First Peoples' art is to engage misrepresentation to interrogate the colonial past, and thus effect political and cultural change in any measure, Rick Hill believes that non-indigenous producers must respect the moral rights and still marginalised location of indigenous producers. The non-indigenous artists' appropriation of indigenous material undermines indigenous efforts, assimilating them once again under controlling standards. In this way, appropriation can be seen to be a revisiting of colonial attitudes. Hill has this to say to non-Native practitioners:

> You White people are so secure in your power that you rarely recognize that you hold it. Even in the allegedly liberated world of art, however, ask yourselves: Who owns the major commercial galleries? Who runs the alternative spaces? Who teaches in art schools? Who dominates and shapes discourse through criticism? Who hands out grants? Who runs and curates the Art Gallery of Ontario, the National Gallery, etc.? Who writes and teaches art history? ... If such an imbalance of power exists amongst this 'alternative' art com-

munity then what, I ask, is my alternative to your alternative? (Hill, 1992:16).

Hill's concerns are echoed in Australia, where the courts recently dealt with Aboriginal artist, John Bulun-Bulun's claim of copyright infringement. In a precedent setting case, the artist was awarded $135,000 damages because his painting, *Sacred Waterhole*, was appropriated, without his permission, on T-shirts (Birnie Danzker, 1990). Bulun-Bulun's painting, accompanied by the illegitimate T-shirts, was exhibited in the Queensland Art Gallery's exhibition, *Balance 1990: Views, Visions and Influences* (1990), to highlight the seriousness of this debate for Aboriginal artists — in both its economic and spiritual dimensions — to the predominantly white audience.

The appropriation of intellectual property — images, stories, spiritual symbolism — is plainly linked to issues of land and cultural property which are more predominantly discussed in the context of restitution. Indeed, Vine Deloria Jr has predicted that greater collaboration between Indian spiritual leaders and archaeologists will be needed to protect and accurately record declared sacred sites and their surroundings because elders 'are very worried that [sites] will be invaded by hundreds of New Agers looking for a spiritual experience' (Deloria, 1992: 598).

RESTITUTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

> Australian archaeologists are just now beginning to discover what Aboriginal people have always known. We have been here for a very, very long time, and furthermore, much to the disgust of some, have no intention of going away even in the light of attempted genocide. Our ancient history is locked in a cultural memory, which in turn is locked in the alcheringa, or as it has been re-named (incidentally, without our permission), the Dreamtime. Non-Aboriginal Australians will eventually receive this history for it will be translated into forms which all can understand by the Aboriginal people themselves. This not only for our benefit, which is sorely needed, but for the benefit of all races. This in spite of the fact that the present constitution of Australia provides little to Aborigines in terms of cultural survival. (Oodgeroo Noonuccal, 1989: 3).

In February 1992, Canadian museum and government workers, academics and First Nations assembled in Ottawa to review and discuss the recommendations of the Task Force Report on Museums and First Peoples. *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples* (CMA & AFN, 1992), was co-sponsored by the Canadian Museum Association and the Assembly of First Nations, and was the result of a two year cross-Canada consultation with Native peoples and museum workers. Addressing the conference on repatriation issues, Rick Hill simply articulated that museums need to

> return objects back to the people who need them, to rebury the dead with the objects with which they were originally interred, and to refrain from ever doing it again. (cited in Harrison, 1992: 10).

Human remains and sacred objects have been central in debates of cultural patrimony since the mid-seventies. Although most museums ceased collecting and displaying human remains decades ago, the majority of State institutions in Australia are required by law to continue to act as repositories for such culturally sensitive materials. In respect of this, and despite legislative strictures, museum policies now concur that

> remains of individuals who have died since contact with European people ... will be dealt with in accordance with the wishes of the deceased or their descendants (CAMA, 1993: 11).

First Peoples' wishes for respect and return of cultural patrimony have been largely honored by museums in Canada and Australia. Repatriation claims sometimes result in the outright return of sacred materials or the reburial of human remains. But, generally speaking, museums have not experienced the massive requests for ethnographic collections predicted in the late 1970s to mid-1980s. Instead, repatriation appears to have paved the way for new dialogues and interactions between museums and First Peoples. The key to these innovative developments is the factor of First Peoples' participation.

The skills of archaeologists are often called upon by First Peoples for clarifying the status of sacred sites. This was the case at Wanuskewin Heritage Park, Saskatchewan, where seven tribes have revived sacred ceremonies at an archaeological site developed into a public heritage centre by the Province with total First Nations direction (Karpan, 1989). First Peoples are increasingly working with archaeologists on research projects to prove their continual occupation of land. These records are often required by indigenous peoples seeking legal protection for sacred sites or for the settlement of land claims (Deloria, 1992). There is every indication that even more interchange will develop if First Peoples' views are respected and incorporated into cultural heritage approaches, especially as they begin to join the profession.

ACCESS AND EQUITY

> There has to be an interchange. It has to be at a planning level, and at a curatorial level. It can no longer be people saying, 'We have an advisory committee, and they're going to be part of public programming. At five o'clock, we'll have a dance troupe come in and dance, and at seven o'clock, someone will come in and chew some muktuk and that will be Indian participation.' (Tom Hill, cited in Anderson 1991: 19)

Access and equity for First Peoples is being promoted in various aspects of cultural heritage, including: collections access and use; a re-examination of collections and their use; and employment and training. Greater access to collections can sometimes mean prohibitions for the public at large. This has been the case in Australia since the mid-80s, where men's and women's sacred/secret materials have been isolated from the public in restricted storage areas for use by local Aborigines with custodial and spiritual privileges in these materials. Since museums have taken such actions in respect of Aboriginal religious customs, they generally report an increased use of collections by elders and members of the broader Aboriginal community. Richard Robins (in press) reports that the Queensland Museum's collection of Australian anthropological materials is utilised predominantly by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who now represent 90% of visitors. Robins attributes this growing interest to his Aboriginal colleague, Michael Aird (and Aird's predecessor, Tina Baum), and their particular ways of working with the Aboriginal community in Brisbane and southeast Queensland.

Hetti Perkins, curator at Boomalli Aboriginal artists Co-operative, Sydney, agrees with Robins. The presence of Aboriginal employees in cultural institutions is integral to institutional change, because until museums prove otherwise, 'many Koorie people believe that the Gallery has nothing to do with them' (Stephen et al, 1993: 13). Aboriginal curators like Perkins insist on a re-examination of inherited museum classification systems — art, history and ethnography — and thus their contributions are immensely valuable to the museum's post-colonial transformation. Such has been the case at Australia's National Gallery, where Curator of Aboriginal Art, Wally Caruna, has integrated depictions of Aborigines by Euro-Australians with Aboriginal artworks to

alter the dominant European art historical narrative. This has created space for a more broadly informed and cross-cultural representation of Aboriginal and European relations.

Evidently, as First Peoples move into positions of greater influence in the museum culture — as curators, educators, policy-makers, managers and trustees — traditions will be challenged and changed with greater frequency. 'Case Studies I' discusses exactly how museums have introduced programs that respect and involve First Peoples, while 'Case Studies II' examines a number of ways indigenous peoples have acted to establish cultural projects in their own communities.

CASE STUDIES I: MUSEUM AND PROFESSIONAL INITIATIVES

The time has come ... for museums to work more closely with Native Americans, rather than simply study and exhibit their histories. Relations of trust must be built up over time. Providing opportunities for cultural empowerment is one way to begin ... Empowering others to speak for themselves does not mean losing one's own voice, but finding it. (Ames, 1990: 171).

THE ROLE OF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY IN INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

Australian and Canadian museums have responded positively to First Peoples' requests to respect differing worldviews and gain equitable representation in contemporary museum culture. Today, most museum workers would agree that

the continuing responsibility of museums to respond to the concerns of indigenous people is a moral imperative (CAMA, 1993: 7).

Initially, however, museum actions were re-active, prompted, in the main, by First Peoples' repatriation claims on collections. Returns of cultural material took place in Canada and Australia as early as 1978, prior to official policy implementation or governmental intervention (MacDonald, 1993; Specht et al, 1991). Recent national museum policy initiatives in Canada and Australia reflect the profession's aspirations to shift from a re-active stance to pro-active ground. Additionally, they indicate the profession's attempt to communicate their aims and efforts to First Peoples and the broader public.

In 1992, the Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations Task Force Report, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples*, urged Canadian museum professionals to develop

an ethical framework and strategies for Aboriginal Nations to represent their history and culture in concert with cultural institutions (CMA & AFN, 1992: 2).

One year later, the Council of Australian Museum Associations released its counterpart, *Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples* (CAMA, 1993). The principles and policies adopted in these reports attempt to balance the interests of museums, First Peoples and the public at large.

While most museums would acknowledge that much remains to be done in building bridges and initiating new ways of working with First Peoples, it is worth stating that the issues of greatest concern have, in the main, been addressed by Australian and Canadian museums in advance of legislative and government proposals. Moreover, these transformations have been achieved without the injections of financial and human resources required to instigate such new and labour-intensive programs. Perhaps this is why museum workers in these countries remain skeptical of legislative measures and continue to emphasise that the moral recognition of First Peoples' rights by museum professionals is imperative for museum reform. Concurrently, they appreciate that legislation is ultimately required to uphold moral responsibility and ethical and professional codes; especially to enforce change within those institutions which will not relinquish traditional mores. This shared attitude between Australian and Canadian museum professionals is well-supported by a brief historical overview that illustrates the maxim, 'If there's a will there's a way'.

AUSTRALIAN AND CANADIAN MUSEUM PRACTICE: PROGRESS IN REVIEW

In respect of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander issues, Australian museums began to implement training and employment programs in the late 1970s (Lofgren & Specht, 1979). Thus far, essential changes have occurred in the following areas: documentation and inventories of state and nation-wide ethnographic collections (Mechan & Bona, 1986); the renovation of storage facilities, establishment of restricted access areas for secret/sacred items, and return of cultural property and policy formation in this area (Anderson, 1986, 1990a, 1990b); the representation of indigenous peoples on staff, boards and advisory committees (Sculthorpe, 1989); the redefinition of permanent displays (Hemming, Jones & Clarke, 1989) and contemporary art exhibition initiatives (Sutton, 1990). The Australian Museum's Aboriginal Collections Policy Document, in contrast to past guidelines, now announces that 'collections emphasis will be on

FIG. 2. Southern Kwakwaka'wakw house at Alert Bay, Canada. W. M. Halliday photo, 1914. (Photo courtesy of of the Royal British Columbia Museum, Victoria, British Columbia).

contemporary culture' (Tacon, 1993: 4). Nation-wide, Australian 'museums support the right of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to self-determination in respect of cultural heritage matters' (CAMA, 1994: 9).

Canadian museum transformations generally parallel Australian developments. However, the beginnings of First Nations' participation in museums can be traced to the employment of Native artists and crafts people for collections development as early as the 1940s on the Northwest Coast (Inglis & Abbott, 1991). Repatriation efforts in Canada also developed early, with the Canadian Museum of Civilization's 1978 repatriation of the Kwakwaka'wakw potlatch collections to Alert Bay and Cape Mudge (Cran-mer Webster, 1992; MacDonald, 1993) (Figs 2-3). Today, museums consult and collaborate with First Nations on all aspects of museum activity — from collections storage and exhibition produc-tion (Conaty, 1989), to curatorial perspectives and interpretations (McMaster & Martin, 1992; Laforet, 1992), and policy development (Byrne, 1993). Perhaps even more importantly, museums,

like the Canadian Museum of Civilization, are often used as meeting places for First Peoples' events. The museum hosted the *Indigena 500 Conference* in 1991, where 'indigenous elders, women and youth of the Americas' shared 'their culture, values and vision' and offered 'guidance to indigenous leaders in the determination of a framework for establishing a dialogue between indigenous peoples and other societies' (Indigena 500 Committee, 1991).

A selective number of case studies indicate how Australian and Canadian museums have broaden-ed traditional practice to respect and include First Peoples' views. These touch on national policy development, repatriation instances, and the revitalisation and reinterpretation of anthropology collections for exhibition pur-poses by indigenous and non-indigenous cultural workers.

NATIONAL MUSEUM POLICY: ENDORSING ABORIGINAL PEOPLES' PRIMARY RIGHTS

The Council of Australian Museums Associa-tions (CAMA, now Museums Australia) began

FIG. 3. Surrendered Kwakwaka'wakw regalia, Alert Bay, Canada. W. M. Halliday photo, 1922. (Photo courtesy of the Royal British Columbia Museum, Victoria, British Columbia).

developing a national policy paper on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage issues relevant to museums in 1991. The resulting document, *Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*, was released in December 1993.

Previous Possessions, New Obligations is a deliberately practical document. Its introduction and preamble concisely summarise the relationships and issues that have been crucial to museum and First Peoples' relations over the past twenty years. Its guiding principles and detailed policies aim to 'guide museums in framing their own procedures for dealing with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and their cultural heritage' (CAMA, 1993: 3). The document consolidates the current position of a minority of influential Australian museums on indigenous cultural heritage matters in the hope that museums throughout Australia will adopt similar policies to foster new relations with Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

The document's first principle states that 'museums support the right of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to self-determination in respect of cultural heritage matters' (9). Therefore, its policies are based on the understanding that 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have special rights in respect of their cultural heritage: they have primary rights' (1). Museums are encouraged to acknowledge 'the totality of indigenous cultures' and their 'holistic' perspective, and to 'act accordingly' (6-7). Significantly, the document promotes 'consultation between museums and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' as 'the essential strategy' in changing attitudes and improving relationships (7). *Previous Possessions, New Obligations* stresses that 'the continuing responsibility of museums to respond to the concerns of indigenous people is a moral imperative' (7).

Previous Possessions, New Obligations was generally welcomed and its principles and policies endorsed by most museums, bureaucrats and Aboriginal organisations and spokespersons. However, some concerns or divergent opinions

FIG. 4. Southern Kwakwaka'wakw dance costume made and worn by Calvin Hunt c. 1980s. (Photo courtesy of the Royal British Columbia Museum, Victoria, British Columbia).

were indicated. Gladstone Regional Art Gallery and Museum Director, Pamela Whitlock, expressed 'concern that policies [were] written with national and state institutions in mind' (24). Also commenting from the viewpoint of small museums, Geoff Speirs of the History Trust of South Australia anticipated 'a mixed reception among private museums and some in towns where relations between [Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal] people "are at flashpoint"' (30). Queensland Museum Director, Alan Bartholomai, while generally endorsing the document as being in accordance with Queensland Museum policy, expressed 'some difficulty with

some aspects of policy on human remains as to policies concerning all cultures' (26).

Overall, the majority of Aboriginal respondents were extremely positive. Northern Land Council Director, Michael Dodson, welcomed 'the broad direction of the policy' (26), and Kimberly Land Council Director, Peter Yu, urged the policy to commit 'museums to support ... Aboriginal self-determination'. Yu stressed that 'community centred approaches are important' and indicated that 'the policy should be identified as the key priority for all museums and government ministers to implement' (25).

REPATRIATION AS A DIALOGIC PROCESS: LINKING THE PAST TO THE FUTURE

> In museums — given the right sort of relationship — Aboriginal groups can make statements about themselves. (Anderson, 1990: 178).

The repatriation of cultural property to First Peoples is an involved and difficult process for museums, and it is equally complex for the indigenous community concerned. A decision on whether or not to return cultural material requires the museum worker to balance the museum's responsibilities to broader research and public education with the rights and needs of the indigenous community in question. Similarly, indigenous communities assume tremendous responsibility in regaining control of lost material that must now be reintegrated into family or community life. For these reasons, museum workers and indigenous peoples seldom view repatriation as a strictly political issue, but rather as a process that establishes long term associations between a museum and a community, and ultimately, holds serious cultural implications for future relations.

The South Australian Museum's experience with the repatriation of secret/sacred materials has resulted in enriched collaborations with indigenous communities. It holds the world's largest collection of Central Australian secret/sacred objects, and this explains, at least partially, why the museum was one of the first in Australia to respond seriously to repatriation claims in the early 1980s. Director, Chris Anderson, encourages museums to enter dialogues with Aboriginal peoples that are not strictly about objects, but focus on the long term sociocultural location and use of the objects: the people and their communities. As Anderson puts it:

> Returning objects is first and foremostly a social act and it is seen as such by Aborigines. ... The return of objects has to be viewed as the establishment of a long term relationship between museums, their researchers and at one level, particular Aboriginal men

and at another, whole groups within communities, if not communities themselves. (Anderson, 1986: 9).

Custodianship of Sacred Objects Project. Anderson's philosophy has guided the South Australian Museum's Custodianship of Sacred Objects Project in Central Australia. The project stresses extensive research of collections and community fieldwork to consult with elders and custodians prior to making decisions about the return of an object. Policies for the return of secret/sacred objects were drafted in 1986. The results of repatriation programs have been varied. At 1991, 130 restricted objects had been returned to the custodianship of Central Australian elders (Anderson, 1991). Conversely, elders have frequently asked that the museum continue to hold sacred objects in its restricted access storerooms. Some previously restricted materials have been freed for exhibition and research due to the knowledge and counsel imparted by elders.

The South Australian Museum's collections have not been diminished through repatriation. Instead, because Aboriginal awareness of museum programs has increased through community consultations and because senior Aboriginal men have visited the collections and storage facilities, the South Australian Museum has been asked to act as a temporary custodian for many sacred objects formerly held in the community. Likewise, its other programs, such as archives and exhibitions, have been greatly enriched by Aboriginal participation (Anderson, 1990a).

The Family History Project. Repatriation at the South Australian Museum has given rise to new collaborative projects with Aboriginal communities. *The Family History Project* demonstrates how museum archives can vitally assist the restoration of heritage and identity to Aboriginal peoples. The project's main aim is to research and make available to Aboriginal families the photographs and genealogies of thousands of Aboriginal people documented by Norman Tindale and Joseph Birdsell on Aboriginal settlements from 1928 to 1957. Living under the Aboriginal Act, many families were fractured and dispersed to settlements throughout Australia, distant from their homelands and lost to their relations. Many children grew up without knowledge of their origins or Aboriginal identity.

Doreen Kartinyeri, a Ngarrindjeri historian, was removed from her family as a child. She was the first Aboriginal person to make use of this archive in the early 1980s, and had already published two South Australian family genealogies

when appointed Aboriginal Research Officer to the project in early 1988. *The Family History Project* is now staffed with three Aboriginal Research Officers and aided by various museum anthropologists. Project teams research and publish the genealogies of particular families in South Australia through archival work. Community consultation is essential to shedding light on the collection. When complete, this information is dispersed to the relevant family or community. Likewise, Aboriginal peoples are encouraged to make use of the material at the museum with the aid of staff members. *The Family History Project* shows how data originally collected for anthropological ends (in this case, academic genetic studies) can be reconstituted to aid 'in giving back to Aboriginal people of Australia their identity' (Kartinyeri, 1990: 12) while simultaneously providing the South Australian Museum with 'important demographic and historical material' (Anderson, 1990a: 177).

Diversification of Visual Displays through Aboriginal Involvement. The South Australian Museum's exhibition programming has also been generously enhanced by Aboriginal participation. Its redeveloped permanent exhibition, *Ngurunderi: An Aboriginal Dreaming* (Hemming, Jones & Clarke, 1989), depended on years of consultation with Aboriginal people from the lower Murray River region, as did the temporary exhibition, *Art and Land: Aboriginal Sculptures of the Lake Eyre Region* (Jones & Sutton, 1986). Contemporary exhibitions have been undertaken, such as *Dreamings* (Sutton, 1988), which featured

> a cross-section of Australian Aboriginal religious art in the classical tradition from three contrasting areas in Australia, the tropical north, the arid centre and the temperate southeast (Anderson, 1990c: 155).

The South Australian Museum's diverse activities and its various kinds of engagements with many Aboriginal communities clearly demonstrate how repatriation actions need not be considered as singular events nor represent a loss to museums. Instead, the South Australian Museum's philosophy proposes that collections are for people, and therefore require a broader and multilevelled social context of interpretation and use. This dialogic approach has permeated all aspects of the museum's programming activities. Collections have been revitalised in ways that increase their traditional and contemporary relevance to both Aboriginal and Euro-Australian peoples.

HUMAN REMAINS CONTROVERSY: REBURIAL
OR COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH?

In Australia, while collaborative efforts that
balance the need for research and repatriation of
skeletal materials have been successfully
developed throughout the 1980s (Lampert, 1983;
Pardoe, 1990; CAMA, 1993), what some would
call more radical solutions have also been
adopted at various stages. Legal proceedings
against the Tasmanian Museum by that State's
Aboriginal community in 1982 led to the return,
and subsequent reburial, of nineteenth-century
Tasmanian skeletal remains known as the Crow-
ther Collection. While most Australian State
museum policies now concur that 'the remains of
individuals who have died since contact with
European people in Australia will be dealt with in
accordance with the wishes of the deceased or
their descendants or the relevant community',
thus perhaps absolving the fate of the Crowther
Collection (CAMA, 1993: 11), the repatriation of
prehistory human remains continues to be
seriously debated world-wide.

The Museum of Victoria has undertaken sig-
nificant skeletal remains reburial exercises which
are considered by many to exemplify a radical
solution. Legislative directives, in tandem with
local Aboriginal community requests for return
and reburial that were supported by the museum's
Aboriginal Advisory Committee, have collec-
tively caused the repatriation of two pre-historic
collections of skeletal remains: the Murray Black
Collection (to a Melbourne burial site) in June
1989, and the Kow Swamp Collection (to the
Echuca community) in August 1990.

The Murray Black skeletal materials came from
five burial grounds in southeastern Australia and
represented the largest single collection held in
this country. It was excavated (some would say
grave-robbed) by George Murray Black, a pas-
toralist in South Gippsland. Encouraged by
anatomists, the amateur archaeologist unearthed
some 1800 individual remains, some 400 genera-
tions removed, between 1929 to 1950. These
were initially deposited in Canberra's Institute of
Anatomy and the University of Melbourne (Mul-
vaney, 1988), until they were legally transferred
to the Museum of Victoria in 1984 under the
*Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Preserva-
tion Act 1972*. The Kow Swamp collection came
to the museum under more typical present-day
circumstances. Alan Thorne, Australian National
University archaeologist, discovered the Kow
Swamp site in 1967 and unearthed some 40 in-
dividual burials between 1968 and 1972 in a

salvage operation to recover the remains from
total demise due to the development of an irriga-
tion channel.

Repatriation claims on the Murray Black and
Kow Swamp collections were initiated by two
Koorie communities in Victoria and proceeded
through legal channels. The museum returned the
materials in accordance with the Commonwealth's
*Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage
Protection Amendment Act 1987*, "Part IIA Vic-
torian Aboriginal Cultural Heritage". Significant
provisions of the Act determined the outcomes
of these claims:

> 21X. (1) If a local Aboriginal community has reason
> to believe that any Aboriginal remains held by a univer-
> sity, museum or other institution were found or came
> from its community area, the local Aboriginal com-
> munity may request the Minister to negotiate with the
> university, museum or institution for the return of the
> remains to the community. (22).

> 21Q. (1) Where Aboriginal remains discovered in Vic-
> toria are delivered to the Minister, he or she shall:

> (a) return the remains to a local Aboriginal community
> entitled to, and willing to accept, possession, custody,
> or control of the remains in accordance with Aboriginal
> tradition. (18).

The museum's decision to return and rebury
two pre-historic collections of skeletal materials
aroused international controversy at the time and
still does. Prominent scientists and academics
whose careers attest to a recognition and support
for equal rights of indigenous peoples in cultural
heritage issues have criticised Victoria's legisla-
tion and contend that unconditional repatriation
and reburial of ancient skeletal collections repre-
sent a major loss not only to universal science but
to the furthering of Aboriginal self-knowledge
(Mulvaney, 1989, 1991). Alan Thorne believes
that the reburial or total destruction of skeletal
collections 'commits [Aboriginals] forever to a
white interpretation of their pre-history'. He says:

> What happens if in 20 years time a black
> paleoanthropologist ... wants to examine this material?
> (Stannard, 1988: 44).

Likewise, not all Aboriginals share political
activist Michael Mansell's view that 'there is no
need to examine human remains' (Stannard,
1988: 44). A recent Koorie Heritage Trust survey
of regional Koorie community concerns found
support for the general preservation of artefacts
and the retention of 'ancient skeletal remains' to
be 'available for scientific research ... based on
the view that such research may assist mankind
in general' (Koorie Heritage Trust, 1990: 8).

Colin Pardoe (South Australian Museum)
agrees that the reburial of the Murray Black col-
lection of human remains is 'a great loss'. How-
ever, he strongly believes that the

assessment of scientific worth must be placed firmly
in the hands of the Aboriginal community. It is they
who must "choose between" science and other values
(Pardoe, 1991: 21-22).

Pardoe contends that the future of Australian
archaeology rests not in conflicting views and
radical solutions but in what he terms 'collabora-
tive assessment', a situation where scientists and
museums begin to share known information
about skeletal collections with Aboriginal com-
munities rather than solely prescribing the uses of
skeletal materials and the particular knowledges
they have traditionally exposed. Simply put,
well-informed decisions that benefit all con-
cerned can be realised by Aboriginal peoples
through information sharing.

EXHIBITION REVITALISATION FROM
INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVES

First Peoples' increased participation in
museums as museum workers and visitors has
resulted in a revitalisation of ethnological collec-
tions. Two Australian and Canadian exhibitions,
which reclaim and reconstitute historical
European material on First Peoples, exemplify
recent projects by indigenous curators and his-
torians. *Portraits of Our Elders* and *Fluffs and
Feathers* show how historical and stereotypical
images of First Peoples can be recontextualised
to represent indigenous peoples' experiences.
These informative projects alert a broader
museum-going public to past injustices, while
simultaneously locating First Peoples' contribu-
tions within a revised historical narrative.

*Reframing History to Erase Stereotypes: A
Recovery of Identity.*

Through his knowledge of the sitters, [Michael Aird]
has achieved a moving document which gives back to
the many previously anonymous subjects, an individual
identity which at once defeats past stereotyping and
mythical ideas of Aborigines as possessionless nomads.
(Bruce, 1993: 27)

Portraits of Our Elders, an historical
photographic exhibition (and accompanying
catalogue), was produced by Aboriginal curator,
photographer and historian Michael Aird for the
Queensland Museum in 1993. *Portraits of Our
Elders* includes photographs from the
Queensland Museum, the John Oxley Library, the
Anthropology Museum of the University of
Queensland, and private collections.

Candice Bruce has observed:

Any discussion about the representation of race in
photography would seem inevitably to lead into a criti-
que on the politics of dominance (Bruce, 1993: 27).

This would appear especially to be the case
when presenting an exhibition of turn-of-the-cen-

FIG. 5. Studio portrait of Rosie Campbell by Poul C.
Poulson, c. 1890s. (Photo courtesy of the Queensland
Museum).

tury photographs of unnamed Aborigines posed
in the stereotypical studio portraits of J.W. Lindt
or the Bain Studio.

Aird's curatorial strategy is to offer 'a glimpse
of the transition that Aboriginal people of
southern Queensland experienced from the 1860s
through to the 1920s' by selecting images that
'demonstrate extremes in situations' (Bruce,
1993). Thus, he looks past stereotypes by jux-
taposing studio poses with intimate family
portraits, sometimes to shocking effect. A poig-
nant example of Aird's strategy are the contrast-
ing and contradictory images of Rosie Campbell
from the 1890s (Figs 5-6). Aird's caption to the
family group further removes the distance and
anonymity of the first image, as he provides
genealogical or historical information on sitters
when available, and often the family histories of
individuals are related through oral histories from
friends and relations. Thus, the text accompany-
ing these two images explains that:

FIG. 6. Family portrait of Rosie Campbell and family taken at Amity Point, May 1891. (Photo courtesy of Bob Anderson — photographer unknown).

Rosie Campbell was just one of the many well-known and respected Aboriginal women from Myora Mission on Stradbroke Island. Many of her grandchildren and their children still live in the region. These people possess many memories of Rosie as well as photographs of her, such as the one above of Rosie with her husband and other members of the Campbell family. (Bruce, 1993: 30)

Revelations of Past Injustices: Exposing the Myth of the Indian in Popular Culture.

Fluffs and Feathers: An Exhibit of Symbols of Indianness (1988 and 1992), was produced by the Native-run Woodland Cultural Centre in southern Ontario. Mohawk curator and historian Deborah Doxtator draws together a range of symbols of 'Indianness' that have been perpetuated in mass culture over the past century to demonstrate the stereotyping and racism faced by First Nations.

Items exhibited are not the pristine, quality artefacts familiar to museum-goers. Instead, one confronts the popular stereotype of the 'Indian' as evinced in dime store novelties, ashtrays, cheap toys, chewing tobacco packages and tourist souvenirs. Corporate advertising logos and product names are in abundance, like, *Red Indian Motor Oil* (circa, 1930), *Pontiac, that's the car for me* (General Motors advertising jingle, 1927) and a *Maryland Chief label for chopped collard greens* (circa, 1970). So are posters and photographs of famous Hollywood screen Indians (Linda Darnell in *Buffalo Bill*), comic books, cartoons, and government and tourist posters.

Off-setting this array of mass-market products are displays titled, *The Borrowed Indian: Indians as a Cultural Resource* and *Once Upon a Time: The Role of Indians in History*. The former explores how images of Indians were appropriated, contrived and inscribed within Canadian nationalist agendas. The latter examines historical illustrations of Indians, from fifteenth century renderings of a dignified, classical-looking people to the *Ugly Customers* sketch (a group of Native women shopping) from a 1870 edition of *The Child's History of Canada* school textbook. Interestingly, the catalogue notes that

hy far the greatest number of negative images of In-
dians are found in the history section (Doxtator, 1992:
64).

Visual arts critic, John Bentley Mays, describes
the exhibition's impact as, a 'strong and sad ...
survey of the most denigrating imagery in
popular culture as I have ever seen'. Furthermore,
he makes the point that:

> When seen in isolation ... an Art Deco table lamp
> graced with a sexily lurching 'Indian' [hasn't] the power
> to raise an eyebrow ... [But], the piling up and astute
> groupings of these images ... reveals the ignorance,
> the stereotyping, the loathing and encouragement for
> contempt at work everywhere and at all times, in the
> mass production of the popular idea of the 'Indian'.
> (Mays, 1992: 4).

Fluffs and Feathers arose from a simple con-
cept: the curators simply gathered together im-
ages of Indians created by white people that
were at various periods distributed throughout
North American mass culture. Collectively,
these items forcefully underscore the notion
that the reclamation of one's culture, from a
First Nations perspective, always requires

> struggling with stereotypes — one dimensional
> prototypes projected by European mythologising
> (Townsend-Gault, 1992: 90).

For this reason, it is imperative that a greater
number of projects like *Portraits of Our Elders*
and *Fluffs and Feathers*, gain favour in
museum programs. Indigenous curators and
historians can provide critical and much-
needed revisions of European history that typi-
cally ignored, denigrated or misrepresented
First Peoples' heritage. These perspectives are
essential to First Peoples' reconnection to their
own past, but equally, they can alert the
dominant society to greater consciousness of
inherited prejudices that endure today.

CASE STUDIES II: INDIGENOUS
CULTURAL INITIATIVES

> We cannot call our building a museum: that would
> mean that our culture is dead. It is not dead, only
> sleeping. (Alfred Douse, High Chief, Kitwancool Band,
> Gitksan, cited in Edwards & Stewart, 1980: 123).

In the post-colonial era, indigenous peoples
who actively pursue cultural restoration within
the broader framework of self-determination
have come to see the museum as an important
resource. Ethnographic collections are being
claimed world-wide as aids to indigenous cultural
revival. Likewise, the local indigenous cultural
centre has been promoted as an alternative to the
more centralised, western-style museum.

HERITAGE AWARENESS: CULTURAL IDENTITY
BEGINS AT HOME

Henrietta Fourmile expresses the needs of
Australian Aboriginal people to gain access to
museum resources in their own communities with
an urgency echoed by many First Peoples:

> Having large centralised collections of our heritage
> often thousands of kilometres away from our com-
> munities is of no use to us. ... What use is it to me
> to have my Yidindji and Kunggandji heritage ... down
> south [Canberra]. I didn't know these things existed
> until I was thirty years of age. Whole generations of
> kids are growing up ... without having access to and
> knowing about fundamental aspects of their birthright.
> ... While [museums and anthropologists] acquire
> knowledge about aspects of our heritage, ours fades
> as our Elders, without access to critical cultural resour-
> ces necessary for the handing on of knowledge, pass
> on. Many Aboriginal communities are starved of these
> vital resources which can enable members to trace
> family, re-establish links with ancestral lands, and
> recover cultural knowledge. (Fourmile, 1990: 59-60)

The idea of local cultural centres has been
generated by indigenous communities themsel-
ves, nation-state governments and cultural
heritage professionals. It has arisen from a multi-
tude of social and heritage trends in past decades,
and while self-determination and cultural restora-
tion represent an overriding ideological force for
First Peoples, they are not singularly responsible
for this development. UNESCO has promoted
world heritage protection and management
(natural and cultural) since the 1950s through a
series of Conventions for use at regional and
national levels. UNESCO's universal doctrine
that 'the cultural heritage of a people' also
'belongs to mankind as a whole' (Makagiansar,
1989: 9) is perhaps at odds with First Peoples'
independence movements. Nonetheless, the or-
ganisation has encouraged the return of cultural
property to communities of origin since the late
1970s (Specht, 1978). In this regard, the social
significance of cultural property to the cultural
identity of a people has been recognised by UN-
ESCO in terms that are congruent with Henrietta
Fourmile's specifically local concerns:

> Being the testimony of peoples' creative acts in the
> course of their history, and being an expression of their
> cultural soul and collective personality, it is in cultural
> heritage that cultural identity is rooted. It is cultural
> identity which provides cohesion to a community and
> which forms a living core of its total being and becomes
> the driving force for its future. The assertion of cultural
> identity is, therefore, inseparable from cultural heritage.
> As such, no people and no nation can afford to ignore
> the preservation and nurturing of its cultural heritage
> lest it risk losing its identity. (Makagiansar, 1989: 9).

World heritage awareness, including repatria-
tion actions by museums, have paralleled
developments in cultural tourism, and indigenous

communities have been implicated in this process, initially, as the providers of significant 'national' resources. Indigenous communities see themselves as the potential beneficiaries of a cultural tourism industry that may support local initiatives. In Australia, national heritage and tourism strategies have recognised the importance of Aboriginal heritage to the construction of a 'national' identity since the early 1970s. A recommendation of *The Preservation of Australia's Aboriginal Heritage* seminar in 1972 stated:

> There is great potential for Aboriginal monuments, antiquities and sites to be developed by Aborigines as part of Australia's expanding tourist industry, [including] ownership of tourist facilities, enterprises and site museums. Such involvement should generate an intense sense of pride and identity in a people who have suffered emotionally as a result of pressures arising out of values forced upon them by the non-Aboriginal community. *(ibid:* 120)

First Peoples' Cultural Centres: Alternative Concepts for Community

This overview illustrates that First Peoples' cultural centres have developed through global heritage consciousness, cultural tourism developments, repatriation actions, and indigenous political and cultural restoration initiatives. However, while governments, institutions and indigenous peoples may articulate shared concerns for cultural heritage protection and restoration, these views are based on disparate ideological positions.

Whereas western societies seek to explore the material evidence of the past in museums, the same cannot be said of indigenous peoples. A principal difference between museums and indigenous cultural centres is the latter's tendency to focus on activities which have immediate relevance to their community rather than on objects and their 'historical' symbolism.

There are numerous reasons for this, a significant one being that until repatriation processes took effect, many indigenous communities did without previous possessions that were vital to their social and spiritual well-being. Linked to historical circumstances of dispossession, is the predominant indigenous view that objects in and of themselves are living only when integrated within and connected to a holistic vision of the world. So, when objects are returned to their communities of origin, they are returned not simply to another 'museum', but are reconstituted into the fullness and complexity of community life. Canadian museum workers who have returned medicine bundles have witnessed the

power inherent in the transformation from museum artefact to spiritual container in Plains Indian religious revival ceremonies (McCormack, 1991; Conaty, 1994).

The indigenous notion of ownership of cultural property (particularly items of a sacred nature) is radically opposed to the museum ideal where collections are held in 'public trust' for the good of a national population. Instead, ownership is grounded in specific religious ceremonies and social and political organisations. Sacred/secret or ceremonial objects, like Aboriginal tjurunga or Plains Indian medicine bundles, are normally held in the care of Elders; individual owners or custodians in positions of authority hold ceremonial rights in these items. Their loss meant that 'some ceremonies simply couldn't be performed without them' and the continuity of patrilineal family connections was disrupted (Anderson, 1990b). The same is true of Canadian Northwest Coast Indian societies where dispossessed potlatch treasures are traceable to particular families (Hoover & Inglis, 1990).

Thus, when cultural centres are established, family associations often become a meaningful aspect of their organisation and development (Cranmer Webster, 1992; Clifford, 1991). So too, do broader community concerns, such as the revival and continuation of traditional skills, ceremonies or languages. Consequently, indigenous cultural centres are often multi-use facilities, incorporating educational functions, community-service needs, and commercial outlets for the sale of local crafts and wares. Whereas many cannot usefully or financially support extended conservation and display efforts required of object-focused museums, they look instead to the cultural needs of their communities.

Origins and Early Manifestations of the Cultural Centre

The indigenous cultural centre in its various manifestations is difficult to trace historically in a global sense. However, review of papers from the 1978 Adelaide seminar, *Preserving Indigenous Cultures: a new role for museums*, shows that a variety of indigenous museums, resource centres or keeping places had developed from grass-roots initiatives or through a combination of local and government initiatives. Many were operational by the early 1970s.

In Canada, the 'Ksan Historic Indian Village at Hazelton, British Columbia began planning its village-to-be in 1947 through the efforts of a local body, the Skeena Treasure House Association. Its

first building — the Skeena Treasure House — opened in 1957. Five more buildings were added in subsequent years, and the completed Village complex officially opened to the public in 1970 (Edwards & Stewart, 1980). Likewise, an early Australian initiative was the Yuendumu Men's Museum located 180 miles north-west of Alice Springs in the Northern Territory. The idea of establishing a restricted-access Aboriginal keeping place to house sacred Warlpiri objects was first discussed in 1963. Six years later funds for the project were being raised locally and the Men's Museum was officially opened in July 1971 (Edwards, 1972).

The Museum of Philippine Traditional Cultures was established in the early 1970s by a private organisation devoted to ethnic minority affairs and community education. An example of a temporal cultural centre, its sole purpose was to house a reference collection to assist a craft revitalisation program amongst villagers. Within four years, the museum had served its purpose: the craft tradition had been rejuvenated. Thus, the museum was dis-established with the idea that the facility itself could be used to engage the local community in other relevant activities (Baradas, 1980).

The intention of the *Preserving Indigenous Cultures* seminar was to 'tackle some of the problems of cultural survival faced by Aboriginal communities in Australia and by indigenous people in Asia, the Pacific and North America' and to examine 'the role museums could play in preserving their culture' (UNESCO Review, 1981: 14). As the 'Ksan Indian Village and the Yuendumu Museum show, indigenous groups have maintained cultural links with their traditions long before UNESCO and others took a direct interest. Perhaps the major achievement of *Preserving Indigenous Cultures* was its message to the museum community, as even today it is cited by many Australian museum workers as the main catalyst for generating an awareness of and support for indigenous cultural heritage issues.

AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT POLICY PROPOSALS: CULTURAL CENTRE FUTURES

Since the Adelaide conference, numerous indigenous cultural centres have been realised in Australia with varying degrees of success. This trend has continued into the present, with discussions on the benefits and necessity of Aboriginal keeping places and museums resurfacing with greater regularity and emphasis in various government reports.

Of note is the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (now the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission) *Draft Departmental Guidelines on the Protection of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage* circulated to the museum community for comment in 1987 (Queensland Museum Archives E84/5). Its policy objectives and strategic goals linked the return of cultural property and Aboriginal control to program strategies and projects that emphasised the development of keeping places, community museums and cultural resource centres.

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs guidelines stressed that 'storage/display facilities for Aboriginal cultural property ideally should be established or developed only at the request of Aboriginals', and 'whatever form ... is adopted, it is to be under Aboriginal control and administration' (2). A commitment to training Aboriginal peoples in museum work and as liaison officers would be supported by government funds and programs. Likewise, State museums were considered integral to the successful implementation of the keeping places policy through repatriation actions, training, and administrative and research support.

While many Australian museums have progressively dealt with restitution issues and have welcomed Aboriginal involvement in cultural heritage affairs since the mid-1980s, proposals raised in the 1987 Department of Aboriginal Affairs *Guidelines on the Protection of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage* are still under review and discussion in the ongoing Australian Aboriginal Affairs Council's (AAAC) Task Force on the Return of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Property. Established in February 1990, and facilitated by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, the aim of the AAAC Task Force is to develop a national policy. To date, however, its series of resolutions on cultural property matters

> do not yet constitute a policy, but rather a series of pointers to directions for policy recommendations (ATSIC, 1993: 3, 4).

Despite slow progress at the policy level, the federal government announced in 1993 that it

> will develop a national strategy, at a cost of $400,000 as part of $1.3 million promised over four years, to return cultural property to indigenous Australians (ACDO, 1993).

This initiative may signal that once again keeping places will gain federal attention in debates about precisely where returned materials will be housed. Regardless of direct government intervention, a recent increase in 'non-traditional'

Aboriginal centres has come to pass. The Brambuk Living Cultural Centre (Budja Budja, Victoria), the Dreamtime Aboriginal Centre (Rockhampton, Queensland) and the Brewarrina Aboriginal Cultural Museum (Brewarrina, New South Wales) are just a few examples of recent enterprises.

Perhaps the main distinction between the western museum and the indigenous cultural centre is the variety and diversity displayed in the latter's formation and utility. The following Australian and Canadian endeavours illustrate how First Peoples are undertaking recent cultural projects at the community level. This small sampling of heritage activities include archaeological sites and cultural centres, rock art sites and keeping places.

INDIGENOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND CULTURAL CENTRES

Branbuk Living Cultural Centre, Budja Budja (Hall's Gap) in Gariwerd (Grampians), Victoria, Australia. The Brambuk Living Cultural Centre was conceived in 1985 as a cooperative venture between the Bramhuk Cooperative (five southwest Victorian Koori communities) and the Victorian Labor cabinet (principally Aboriginal Affairs and Tourism), just one year after the Grampian region was declared a national park. The Cooperative's proposal to build a living Koori cultural centre in the midst of significant rock art sites in the Grampian Ranges was approved immediately. The centre's architect, Gregory Burgess, based the building's winding and curvaceous design and colouring on the surrounding mountains and natural vegetation. Conceptually, after much Koori consultation, it followed

> the notion of five circles, in part a homage to the Lake Condah dwellings elsewhere in Victoria's western district, but also representing each of the Koori communities involved (Davidson, 1991: 32).

In 1990, the $2 million centre won the Zelman Cowen Award for innovative architecture.

Molly Dyer, a long-time Koori activist, sees the centre as

> a celebration of Aboriginality, something which should be national in scope, although focused on the Bramhuk communities (Davidson, 1991: 34).

Displays focus on early Aboriginal and white conflict under headings like 'Despicable Race', and others chart more recent injustices within living memory, such as mission life and cultural assimilation. Koori relationships to land are explored through plant walks and rock art tours, and permanent audio-visual displays inform visitors

of pre-contact Koori history and the 'material and spiritual culture of the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali people of the Gariwerd area'. Three-tiered schools programs have been in effect since 1991 (Clark, 1991: 11). The Koori-controlled centre is predominantly staffed by Kooris — managers, tours guides and rangers — with some white representation.

The Bramhuk Living Cultural Centre, while focusing on Koori cultural heritage, also functions more broadly as a community cultural centre for the region. Therefore, some activities are inclusive and accepting of cultural diversity. For instance, the first function held in the centre's hall was a Greek wedding. Signage outside the main entrance states Brambuk's objectives as:

> A place where both Koori and non-Koori people can come together to share the knowledge of the past and discuss the issues confronting Koori people today ... Together, we can improve the future. (Davidson, 1991: 34)

Tourism is the most significant route for Brambuk to develop long-term maintenance, particularly as its primary source of funding was provided only for its first three years of operation. However, this commercial aspect is very much at odds with Koori aims to reinforce cultural identity through education and stronger community ties.

Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump Interpretive Centre, Fort Macleod, Alberta, Canada.

> Inside the museum, looking at the various items depicting the history of the buffalo and the people who hunted them, my attention shifted from the display cases to the people who were tending them. I became aware that the facility was staffed entirely by Indians (Blackfoot ... from a nearby reserve). But I found myself thinking that they didn't look like Indians to me, the Indians I knew from my school books and from the movies, the Indians, in fact, who were depicted inside the museum displays I was looking at. That is where most of us are used to seeing Indians, from the other side of a sheet of glass. But at Head-Smashed-In, they were running the place. They stood around in jeans and dresses and plaid shirts — not feather headdresses and leather moccasins — talking and laughing. If curious visitors like myself asked them something, they answered thoroughly but not pedantically: as if this was something they knew, not something they had studied.
>
> After a long afternoon learning about the buffalo, I left Head-Smashed-In dimly aware that I had changed my mind about something. It had been an encounter not just with an important place in the history of the continent, but also with an idea, my own idea about what an Indian was. If I thought I had known before, I didn't think I knew anymore. (Francis, 1992: 2-3).

The Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump Interpretive Centre was built in 1987 on a UNESCO World Heritage Site in southern Alberta: a long,

11 metre high cliff. The significance of the site lies in the unseen archaeological remains buried up to 10 metres deep. These

> relate to a saga of the use of this cliff by Plains Indians as a buffalo jump, a sophisticated and elaborate system of stampeding large herds of buffalo to their deaths, as far back as 6,000 years ago. Head-Smashed-In, according to Peigan legend, is named for a young boy who fell victim to his own curiosity. Hiding in the shelter of a cliff ledge, to get a more exciting view of the buffalo falling to their death, he was trapped against the cliff wall by the pile of bodies. He was found later with his skull crushed and the Jump was named "Itsipa'ksikihkinihkootsiiyapo'pi" (where he got his head smashed in). (Sponholz, 1988: 8)

Head-Smashed-In is one of the oldest and best-preserved buffalo jump sites in North America. The Interpretive Centre is governed by the provincial government's Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism and Historic Sites departments. However, the involvement of Blackfoot Nations (Peigan, Blood and Blackfoot bands) has been essential to successive phases of the Centre's development (Brink, 1992).

Tribal Elders have been consulted on centre themes and the selection of artefacts and texts for exhibitions. Medicine bundle (ceremonial objects) displays require the presence of Elders for installation, removal and regular cleansing ceremonies. Likewise, purification ceremonies are periodically conducted to bless the Jump and Interpretive Centre staff. Over half the employees of the centre are Native, and one of the qualifications for a tour guide is that they speak Blackfoot. The centre has established innovative training programs for youth from nearby reserves, and has thus become an important source of employment and cultural education for Native peoples in southern Alberta.

Overall, the Centre's building and exhibitions retain the features of the modern museum. While the $9.8 million facility is built into the hillside to respect the natural surround, its material impression of multi-levelled concrete cubes and internal glass walls is distinctly modernist. Similarly, the exhibitions resemble those of ethnographic museums with objects in glass cases, photographic and text panels, dioramas, free-standing buffalo, and a series of audio-visual presentations. However, as the Centre focuses specifically on the history and culture of the Plains Indians, particularly the buffalo hunt, and most of the attendants are Native, the prominence of traditional presentational forms is lessened the longer one attends to the displays. Significantly, one soon discovers that the exhibitions simply elucidate and anticipate the key element in the

Centre's success: the buffalo jump itself. Visitors move outdoors onto trails that lead to the bottom of the cliff and to the jump point. This natural spectacle links the visitor's indoor experience to an environmental context.

CULTURAL REVITALISATION: ROCK ART SITES

Ngarinyin Rock Art Restoration Project, Central Kimberley Plateau, Western Australia. The Wanang Ngari Cultural Corporation in Derby initiated a cultural continuity project for young people in 1986. The rock art restoration project took place at caves located some 310 kilometres west of Derby. Its objective and proposed community benefits were:

> To enable traditional Aboriginal people to protect and conserve Wandjina paintings and sites of significance with a view to train young Aboriginal people to continue this process forever. ... This project will help in re-establishing ties with areas of country and will rejuvenate ritual and ceremonial practices for Ngarinyin people. (Mowljarlai & Peck, 1987: 71).

The project functioned jointly as a program for cultural revitalisation and youth employment: it was funded by a $110,000 Commonwealth (Community Employment Program) grant. Twelve young people under 30 years of age were employed to work alongside elders to record and restore sites located in Ngarinyin country in the central Kimberley Plateau, Western Australia. Oral histories, as told by elders and pertinent to the sites, were documented on tape, selected sites were re-painted using traditional methods under the tutelage of elders and their families, and other sites were conserved (cleaned and maintained) and protected (fenced and signed) using non-Aboriginal methods.

Prior to beginning the project, the Wanang Ngari Cultural Corporation held a meeting to establish project parameters. They would only re-paint sites that were faded and needed painting, photographs were to be taken of each site before re-painting, and an elder was to be present during each restoration to tell the young people the story about the place and demonstrate how to paint in traditional ways. Importantly, the custodians of each site were consulted, and they agreed that the re-painting should be done. David Mowljarlai and Cyril Peck explain the currency of the project for the Ngarinyin people:

> Our language, our ways, our stories and our art must be shared and given to the next generation — this is how it has always been. It is not just nice to re-paint the sites, it's got to be done. You see Wandjinas have power and we must look after them so the power is used properly. Some white people who worked with us early on told the world about our art a long time ago. They knew that re-painting was done again and

again. They saw art being repainted in some places. In other places they saw art left to fade because those people had passed away. We will make sure this does not happen to the sites whose names and stories we still know. (Mowljarlai & Peck, 1987: 71)

By 1987, eight sites had been re-painted and twelve young people experienced Ngarinyin culture through the teachings of the elders. However, the restoration of Aboriginal rock art has not been without controversy (Michaels, 1988). Re-painting is often viewed as an elimination of a past record, in this case, the destruction of a testament to a 'universal' prehistory. Thus, the restoration and/or re-painting of rock art sites in Australia by local Aboriginal groups has been severely criticised by some archaeologists, conservationists and others, who, in the interests of science, world heritage and cultural tourism, would propose other means of dealing with the problems of deterioration of rock art sites. In the Ngarinyin project, Mowljarlai & Peck experienced such opposition when:

A station owner interested in tourism to rock art sites had this project stopped before we were finished. He said that we used house paint, wrote our names, painted cartoon animals and behaved in the wrong way. There is little or no truth in his complaints. Of course in a new project we are learning and some things could have been done better, but the Ngarinyin people did a good job.

Cultural restoration and revival projects require negotiation and compromise between Aboriginal communities and non-Aboriginal cultural industry workers. The Ngarinyin project demonstrates the needs of the community to educate youth in cultural traditions of which rock art re-painting is only one aspect. Here, Ngarinyin peoples' needs took precedent over those of outsiders, be they scientists or potential tourists seeking evidence of a 'past' culture.

ABORIGINAL KEEPING PLACE: RESTRICTING ACCESS

Yuendumu Men's and Women's Museums, Northern Territory, Australia.

"MEN ONLY. WATIMIPA." — signage Yuendumu Museum (Michaels, 1987: 29).

The Yuendumu Men's and Women's Museums were established to preserve the cultural traditions of eight skin groups (or clans) of the Warlpiri peoples. Opened in 1971, the Men's Museum was the first Aboriginal keeping place in Australia to hold secret/sacred objects and paintings which had traditionally been hidden out bush. Many elders were skeptical of the notion of a 'museum' when the idea was first proposed in 1963. Others believed that a centralised storage area would ensure non-interference with sacred

sites scattered around Yuendumu, and hoped a museum would strengthen the traditional culture, particularly for the young people.

The [Men's] museum, it was thought, would have the role of a school. It would be a centrally located place where young men could be tutored in tribal matters. (Edwards, 1972: 55).

Funds for the museum were raised by settlement staff and the community, while other contributions came from the Aboriginal Benefits Trust Fund, a fund that distributes mining royalties paid by large companies operating on tribal lands. Secret/sacred items moved into storage included tjurungas and bull roarers. Elders of each skin group painted sacred paintings on the internal walls and the earthen floor of the keeping place. Access to the Men's Museum is denied to Warlpiri women and uninitiated men. Adult European men and Aboriginals of other tribes known to the Warlpiri are sometimes allowed to enter, along with European women over 40 years of age under certain conditions.

In the intervening decades, the Yuendumu Museums have experienced a transformation that reflects a range of immediate local circumstances common to any community, including social disturbances and lack of resources. Early on, the museums were vandalised by local youth. As a result, a number of secret/sacred objects were stolen, and subsequently lost or sold to passing tourists. Security measures at the museums were not adequate (or not in keeping with local custom) to maintain continual surveillance for protection of the premises and items housed. Individual custodians began to remove items from the museum by the early to mid-eighties. Many were sent by elders to the South Australian Museum for safekeeping and temporary custodianship. Other items were taken out bush to traditional keeping places where they remain today.

In western understanding, the so-called, 'troubled' history of the Yuendumu Museums does not constitute a successful enterprise in preserving and conserving cultural heritage. In Yuendumu, despite the museums' fluctuating circumstances, Warlpiri consistently link present cultural expression with traditional practice in many ways. Yuendumu is a community rich in artists who have marketed and exhibited their art widely and have therefore extended aspects of their cultural expression far beyond the community.

In April 1985, locally produced, daily television transmissions began from the studios of the Warlpiri Media Association. Local material — interviews with elders, community an-

FIG. 7. Painting on the school doors, Yuendumu. From 'After 200 years: Photographic Essays of Aboriginal and Islander Australia Today', Penny Taylor (ed.). (Photo courtesy of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies).

nouncements and meetings, story-telling, and documentaries of ceremonies (such as the Fire Ceremony) — has been produced in Yuendumu since 1982. The first videotape the community directed was an afternoon of casual dancing held at the Women's Museum (Michaels, 1987).

Another important development in Yuendumu is the Warlukurlangu Artists group formed initially in 1983 when a number of Warlpiri women began to decorate canvas boards with traditional designs. Several senior men proposed to paint the Yuendumu school doors with Dreaming designs to pass on their knowledge to the young people in 1984, and since then, the art movement has escalated (Fig. 7). Many Warlukurlangu artists have had their work purchased by major public galleries and private collections (Lennard, 1990). In 1989, Francis Jupurrurla Kelly (largely responsible for the independent television initiative at Yuendumu) and six Warlpiri male artists contributed a large-scale ground painting to the 'Magiciens de la Terre' contemporary art exhibition held at the Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris (McKenzie, 1990).

CONCLUSION

First Peoples' understanding and articulation of cultural heritage matters involves, but is not solely restricted, to museum locales. Cultural heritage, in a climate of indigenous political assertion and cultural rejuvenation, is much more than objects in buildings. It encompasses a revitalisation of family relationships, languages, religion, connections to land, and economic, social and political reorganisation. The museum's return of cultural property to a community of origin is as important as official recognition of traditional forms of Aboriginal medicine or customary law.

However, moral recognition of First Peoples' cultural rights is not enough. First Peoples' want governmental policy and legislative reforms. These are imperative to ensure that First Peoples' rights as citizens with distinct sociocultural needs will be appreciated and respected by the dominant citizenry: descendants of settler societies and recent migrant groups.

The museum can play a key role in aiding First Peoples' broader aspirations for self-determination. They are storehouses of knowledge; knowledge that can assist First Peoples in establishing links to a fractured past. In this respect, the museum's rectification of historical misrepresentations can do much to unhinge stereotypical public perceptions of First Peoples. Likewise, the restoration of cultural property can support the revival of religious or social ceremony, and re-establish family and community relations. The empowerment of First Peoples as the speakers for their heritage in its diversified forms and contexts is essential. First Peoples' wish to control their heritage is a complex and layered issue, one with which museums and First Peoples are still grappling. However, First Peoples' claim to own and manage their cultural heritage is a challenge museums must openly face in order to achieve substantial and genuine intellectual, structural and policy reforms.

GUIDE TO KEY SOURCES

AIRD, Michael, 1993. 'Portraits of Our Elders'. This recent Australian museum exhibition and catalogue illustrate how ethnographic collections may be revitalised by Aboriginal interpretation. 'Portraits of Our Elders' is simultaneously a historical survey of Aboriginal studio portraits from the 1860s to the 1920s, and a family album of sorts. Early portraits show how European settlers viewed the Aborigine, but Aird contrasts these stereotypical depictions with family portraits to indicate how Aborigines perceived themselves.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS, 1991. 'Museums and Native Americans renegotiating the contract'.

This issue of the professional association's journal includes seven articles on museum initiatives in policy and programming that take into account the rights of Native Americans. Topics addressed include: the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act, its impact on museums and significance for Native Americans; an Arizona funding program to assist tribal museums with repatriation processes; future plans for the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian; the repatriation policy of Chicago's Field Museum; and case examples of collaborative museum projects throughout the United States.

AMES, Michael, 1990. Cultural empowerment and museums; opening up anthropology through collaboration. Ames considers how museums might respond to First Nations cultural and political interests through a clearer understanding of cultural difference. His salient point is that First Nations and museums hold fundamentally distinctive cultural and political concepts: First Nations possess a holistic worldview, whereas museum traditions favour classificatory systems of interpretation.

ANDERSON, Chris, 1990a. Australian Aborigines and museums — A new relationship. This article encapsulates Anderson's published writings since the mid-1980s about the necessity for Australian museums to establish new relations with First Peoples. He provides an overview of Aboriginal perceptions of the museum, including an important discussion of the conflicting pressures brought to bear on many communities because of a renewed interest in Aboriginal culture by museums and tourism. The ways in which Australian museums have generally responded to repatriation claims and increasing demands for Aboriginal involvement are summarised with focus on the South Australian Museum.

CANADIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION, 1988. 'Museums and First Nations'. This special issue of the association's professional journal includes both Native and Non-Native perspectives. Museum professionals address three main themes: the erasure of stereotypes in museums and popular culture; the repatriation of collections to Native-run cultural centres; the relevant institutional context for presenting contemporary Indian art. Canadian proposals for indigenous museum policies are discussed, as is the impact of First Nations' politics on museums. Profiles of indigenous cultural centres, and reviews of Native exhibitions and books are featured.

CANADIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION and the ASSEMBLY OF FIRST NATIONS, 1992. 'Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples'. Recommendations for equal working partnerships between museums and First Nations were developed through nation-wide consultations with Native and non-Native museum workers. As such, the report emphasises the common and shared interests of First Peoples and museums. It promotes a commitment to mutual recognition and respect for both worldviews, and advocates the principle of shared management responsibilities through liberal approaches to repatriation, access, training and interpretation.

CLIFFORD, James, 1991. Four Northwest Coast Museums: travel reflections. Clifford's travelogue offers 'personal impressions of the locales, buildings, and styles of exhibition' of the U'mista Cultural Centre, Alert Bay, the Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Centre, Cape Mudge (Native-run cultural centres), the Royal British Columbia Museum, Victoria, and the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology, Vancouver. The text reflects on how institutional frameworks (tribal or western museum) or interpretative contexts (aesthetic or ethnological) influence the visitor's reading of cultural materials.

COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION, 1993. 'Previous Possessions, New Obligations'. The CAMA policy is based on the principle that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have 'inherent interests' in the 'care and control, spiritual and practical, of their cultural property'. Noting that museums are legally bound to hold Australian indigenous collections, the report, nonetheless, ethically supports Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rights to self-determination in respect of cultural heritage matters. Therefore, the policy encourages museums nation-wide to recognise indigenous rights by setting policies and developing programs to improve current and future relations between museums and Australia's First Peoples.

DOXTATOR, Deborah, 1992. 'Fluffs & Feathers: An Exhibit on the Symbols of Indianness'. The catalogue for the exhibition 'Fluffs and Feathers' is a valuable resource guide for how the First Nations of Canada have been imagined by Europeans since first contact. It examines 'symbols of Indianness' in popular culture (tourism, cinema, advertising), history (academy and government), and museum (art and anthropology) contexts. A revisionist history project by a Native curator and Native historian, 'Fluffs and Feathers' bluntly exposes the severity and persistence of prejudice and racism experienced by First Nations into the present through the visual projections of the dominant Euro-Canadian culture.

FOURMILE, Henrietta, 1990. Possession is nine-tenths of the law — and don't Aboriginal people know it! Fourmile examines varying concepts of ownership in relation to collections of Aboriginal cultural property held in public museums. From an Aboriginal perspective, she reviews the colonial bias of museums and its ongoing manifestation in the concept of Crown ownership which legally refuses Aboriginal claims of moral ownership. She identifies the key players in Aboriginal cultural property and heritage ownership struggles — curators and anthropologists in museums, government ministers, elders and communities — and examines the ownership arguments of each group — scientific, legal and moral. Fourmile challenges governments and museums to de-colonise by recognising Aboriginal moral rights through legislative reform and repatriation.

HILL, Rick, 1988. Sacred trust: cultural obligation of museums to Native People. Hill offers a Native viewpoint on the ethical responsibilities of Canadian museums to take seriously Native cultural heritage concerns, in both legal and moral ways. The historical roots and prevalent ethnocentrism of a white-dominated museum profession are noted as a major hurdle in erasing stereotypical perceptions that detract from the self-determination efforts of First Nations. Hill examines the politics of collecting Native materials, noting that human rights, religious rights and aboriginal rights have been considered in collection activities only recently.

HILL, Rick, 1992. One part per million: white appropriation and Native voices. Hill addresses the appropriation of Native images and culture by non-Native artists. He believes appropriation practices ideologically share much with early colonial attitudes of disrespect and misunderstanding of a different culture. Non-Native artists using Native imagery reinforce homogeneous stereotypes, and disempower Native artists of their particular cultural voices, visions, identities and moral rights.

HINSLEY Jr, Curtis, 1981. 'Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology 1846 1910'. Hinsley traces the development of anthropology from the founding of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846 to the decline of the federal Bureau of American Ethnology at the turn-of-the-century. An insightful combination of institutional, biographical and intellectual history, Hinsley examines anthropology's institutional progress from an ill-defined to a scientific discipline. The ideas, morals and endeavours of influential figures in the field, such as John Wesley Powell, Otis Mason, and Franz Boas, are set against the religious, intellectual and political concerns of their day.

INGLIS, Richard & ABBOTT, Donald 1991. A tradition of partnership: The Royal British Columbia & First Peoples Museum. This

museum has been developing a mutually beneficial working relationship with the First Peoples of British Columbia for decades. Inglis and Abbott address the question of how a Western museum begins to include other voices, and provide a history of their institution's partnerships with First Peoples. A series of recent examples of collaborative projects, from repatriation and archaeological projects to exhibitions and festivals, are highlighted.

McMASTER, Gerald & MARTIN, Lee-Ann (eds), 1992. 'Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives'. 'Indigena', a contemporary First Nations art exhibition organised by the Canadian Museum of Civilization, was produced by a team of Native curators, artists and writers as a critical response to the 'celebration' of Columbus' founding of the Americas. Colonisation of the Arctic; the significance of repatriation for Native communities; and a Native perspective on the discovery of America are some of the topics covered by Native historians, anthropologists, filmmakers, authors and artists.

MICHAELS, Eric, 1987. 'Towards a Cultural Future: Francis Jupurrurla Makes TV at Yuendumu'. Michaels discusses his involvement in an independent and interventionist television project at Yuendumu in the Northern Territory during the mid-1980s. Community-produced videotapes documented various local events: ceremonies and dances, public meetings, storytelling. This culturally-specific and community-based television project indicates a potential challenge to western conceptions of media production and use. However, Michaels poses realistic questions about the survival possibilities of interventionist, indigenous production within government and corporate-controlled communications systems.

MULVANEY, D.J. 1991. Past regained, future lost: the Kow Swamp Pleistocene burials. Mulvaney criticises legislative instruments which required the Museum of Victoria to return for reburial prehistoric skeletal materials in recent years: the Kow Swamp and Murray Black collections. While acknowledging the importance of Aboriginal rights to self-knowledge, Mulvaney argues that the significance of global knowledge may be equally as great. The essay reviews the arguments for and against reburial, particularly in the case of prehistoric materials, and considers the meaning of repatriation exercises in the current climate of Aboriginal self-determinism.

PARDOE, Colin, 1991. Eye of the storm. Pardoe states that the future of Australian archaeology is one of Aboriginal ownership, and professionals working collaboratively with Aboriginal communities since the mid-1980s are supportive of such developments. He criticises the media's role in perpetuating a stereotype of controversy around the skeletal remains issue, one that places indigenous peoples and archaeologists in extremist camps of religion and science.

SNOW, Elizabeth, 1993. Archaeology policy development in Canada: a case study in cultural policy. Snow reviews the proposed 'Archaeological Act respecting the protection of the archaeological heritage of Canada 1990'. Snow provides a summary account of the history, rationale, and process of developing the draft legislation. The Proposed Act's assertion of Crown ownership of archaeological resources and its failure to clearly address Aboriginal ownership of these resources is cited as a key reason for its demise.

SPECHT, Jim, 1979. Anthropology. Anthropology and archaeology within Australia's first State museum are traced through a discussion of the intellectual orientation, collecting practices and fieldwork enterprises of the museum's curators and administrators over almost two centuries. This informative overview details how museums approached indigenous collections research, management and exhibitions, and the roles curators and administrators played in early public education and legislative reform, despite often sporadic financial infrastructures and minimal public support for Aboriginal collections and studies until more recent decades.

SPECHT, Jim, 1993. Museums and cultural heritage of the Pacific Islands. Specht reviews indigenous self-assertion movements, with respect to museums and cultural heritage issues, in the Pacific region where the first decolonisation came in 1962. In the past 25 years, organisations such as UNESCO and the Australian government have increasingly supported, in principle, the inherent rights of First Peoples to own, manage and determine the future of their cultural heritage. Specht measures theoretical proposals and actions taken during this period against the practical problems of achieving the desired results, and proposes that a re-evaluation of approaches and cooperative effort is needed.

TYMCHUK, Michael, 1985. Museums, anthropology and skeletal remains. An early, but still relevant, essay on the disinterment, use and retention, and repatriation of indigenous skeletal remains by museums and anthropologists. Tymchuk outlines the conflicting views of Native

Americans (cultural needs of a community) and museums and scientists (universal knowledge), arguing that sincere negotiations and moderate opinions can best satisfy the needs of both groups.

REFERENCES

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION 1993. Policy Development and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Property, Issues paper no. 3.

AIRD, M. 1993. 'Portraits of Our Elders'. (Queensland Museum: Brisbane).

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS 1991. Museums and Native Americans renegotiating the contract, Museum News 70:

AMES, M. 1990. Cultural empowerment and museums; opening up anthropology through collaboration. In Pearce, S. (ed.) 'Objects of Knowledge'. Pp. 158-173. (The Athlone Press Ltd: London & Atlantic Highlands).

ANDERSON, C. 1921. The objects of the Australian Museum. Australian Museum Magazine 1: 3-4.

ANDERSON, C. 1986. Research and the return of objects as social process. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists, October: 2-10.

  1990a. Australian Aborigines and museums a new relationship. Curator 33: 165-179.

  1990b. The economics of sacred art: the uses of a secret collection in the South Australian Museum. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 23: 31-42.

  1990c. "Dreamings" in the USA: project management and the Native audience. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 23: 155-161.

  1992. Submission to the Review of the South Australian Museum. Unpublished paper submitted to the Review of the South Australian Museum.

ANDERSON, J.C. 1991. The custodianship of sacred objects project: An overview. Records of the South Australian Museum 25: 111-112.

ANDERSON, M. 1991. Chipping away at the foundations of the museum community. Artscraft 2: 19.

ANON 1980. 'Ksan the story of the 'Ksan people of British Columbia, Canada, and their fight to save their culture. In Edwards, R. & Stewart, J. (eds), 'Preserving Indigenous Cultures: A New Role for Museums'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

ATLEO, E.R. 1991. Policy development for museums: A First Nations perspective. BC Studies 89: 48-61.

AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM 1957. The Museum. Australian Museum Magazine 12: 156-159.

BARADAS, D.B. 1980. Developing or traditional area museums. In Edwards, R. & Stewart, J. (eds) 'Preserving Indigenous Cultures: A New Role for Museums'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

BENTLEY MAYS, J. 1992. Face to face with racism. The Globe and Mail, 19 Dec., p. C4.

BIRNIE DANZKER, J. 1990. Cultural apartheid. Muse, Autumn: 20-26.

BRINK, J. 1992. Blackfoot and Buffalo Jumps: Native People and the Head-Smashed-In Project, Alberta. Studies in the Arts and Sciences 3: 19-43.

BROMILOW, G. 1993. Finders keepers?. Museums Journal, March: 31-34.

BROCKMAN, A. 1989. Our northern heritage: opting for a living heritage. Up here, Life in Canada's North 5: 22-25.

BRUCE, C. 1993. Portraits of our elders. Photofile 40: 26-29.

BURGER, J. 1990. 'The Gaia Atlas of First Peoples: A Future for the Indigenous World'. (Penguin: Ringwood: Victoria).

CANADIAN MUSEUM ASSOCIATION 1988. Museums and First Nations. Muse 6:

CANADIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION AND THE ASSEMBLY OF FIRST NATIONS 1992. 'Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples'. (Canadian Museums Association & Assembly of First Nations: Ottawa).

CLARK, I. 1991. Brambuk Living Cultural Centre. Agora 4: 10-12.

CLIFFORD, J. 1991. Four Northwest Coast Museums: travel reflections. Pp. 212-254. In Lavine, S.D. & Karp, I. (eds) 'Exhibiting Cultures: poetics and politics of museums display'. (Smithsonian Institution Press: Washington).

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA 1987. 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984', (consolidated version). (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

CONATY, G.T. 1989. Canada's First Nations and Museums: A Saskatchewan experience. The International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship 8: 407-413.

  1994. Relationships, power and sacred objects. Paper presented to Organizing the Past, 12th International Conference on Organizational Symbolism, University of Calgary, Alberta, July.

COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION 1993. 'Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples'. (Council of Australian Museums Association Inc.: Melbourne).

CRANMER WEBSTER, G. 1992. From Colonization to Repatriation. Pp. 25-37. In McMaster, G. & Martin, L. (eds) 'Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives'. (Douglas & McIntyre, Vancouver/Toronto and Canadian Museum of Civilization: Hull).

CRUIKSHANK, J., SIDNEY, A., SMITH, K. & NED, A. 1990. 'Life Lived Like A Story: Life Stories of Three Yukon Native Elders'. (University of Nebraska: Lincoln).

DAVIDSON, J. 1991. Brambuk, capital Gariwerd. Pp. 32-35 in Australian Society.

DELORIA Jr, V. 1992. Indians, archaeologists, and the future. American Antiquity 57: 595-598.

DOXTATOR, D. 1992. 'Fluffs & Feathers: An Exhibit on the Symbols of Indianness'. (Woodland Cultural Centre: Brantford, Ontario).

1992. Reconnecting the past: an Indian idea of history. Pp. 25-33. In Doxtator, Fisher, Hill & Pakasaar 'Re-visions'. (Walter Phillips Gallery, The Banff Centre, Banff: Alberta).

DUNN, M. 1991."My grandfather is not an artifact": A report on the Aboriginal Archaeological Heritage Symposium'. (Department of Communications, Archaeology Branch: Ottawa).

DURHAM, J. & FISHER, J. 1988. The ground has been covered. Artforum 26: 99-105.

EDWARDS, G. 1972. Australian Aboriginal Museum preserves an ancient culture. Asia Pacific Quarterly of Cultural and Social Analysis 4: 54-56.

EDWARDS, R. & STEWART, J. (eds) 1980. 'Preserving Indigenous Cultures: A New Role for Museums'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

EDWARDS, R. (ed.)1975. 'The Preservation of Australia's Aboriginal Heritage', Report of National Seminar on Aboriginal Antiquities in Australia, May 1972. (Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies: Canberra).

FOURMILE, H. 1987. Aborigines and museums: a case study in contemporary scientific colonialism. Praxis M 17: 7-11.

1989. Aboriginal heritage legislation and self-determination. Australian-Canadian Studies 7: 45-61.

1990. Possession is nine-tenths of the law — and don't Aboriginal people know it!. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 23: 57-65.

FOUNDATION FOR ABORIGINAL AND IS-LANDER RESEARCH ACTION 1992. 'The Mabo Case: An Easy Guide'. (Foundation for Aboriginal and Island Research Action: Brisbane).

FRANCIS, D. 1991. 'The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture'. (Arsenal Pulp Press: Vancouver).

GARTON, S. 1989. Aboriginal history. In Walter, J. (ed.) 'Australian Studies: A Survey'. (Oxford University Press: Melbourne).

GRIFFIN, G. & SHELLEY, R. 1993. Dreamtime in a cow town: the Dreamtime Cultural Centre in Rockhampton Queensland. Culture and Policy 5: 157-176.

GRUBER, J.W. 1970. Ethnographic salvage and the shaping of anthropology. American Anthropologist 72: 1289-99.

HAGELBERG, E. 1990. Bones, dry bones. The Times Higher Education Supplement, 14 December.

HARRISON, J.D. 1992. Turning the page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples

Conference — Personal Reflections. Alberta Museums Review 18: 10-12.

HEMMING, S., JONES, P. & CLARKE, P. 1989. 'Ngurunderi: An Aboriginal Dreaming-The Culture of the Ngarrindjeri People'. (South Australian Museum: Adelaide).

HILL, R. 1988. Sacred trust: cultural obligation of museums to Native People. Muse 6: 32-33.

1992. One part per million: white appropriation and Native voices. Fuse 15: 12-22.

1993. Indian Insights into Indian Worlds. ICOM News 46: 7-8.

HINSLEY Jr, C. 1981. 'Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology 1846-1910'. (Smithsonian Institution Press: Washington).

HOPGOOD, F. 1991. Aboriginal cultural heritage: a repossession of self. Ormond Papers 8: 108-117.

HORSE CAPTURE, G.P. 1991. Survival of culture. Museum News 70: 49-51.

HOULE, R. 1991. Sovereignty over subjectivity. C magazine 30: 28-35.

INDIGENA 500 COMMITTEE 1991. Strengthening the spirit, press release, 26 March.

INGLIS, R. & ABBOTT, D. 1991. A tradition of partnership: The Royal British Columbia Museum & First Peoples. Alberta Museums Review 17(2): 17-23.

JAMIESON, M.E. 1989. First Nations Cultural Institutions Policy: Discussion Paper. Paper for National Committee of Indian Cultural Education Centres, Canada, November.

JONAS, W. 1991. 'Consultation with Aboriginal People About Aboriginal Heritage: Report to the Australian Heritage Commission'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

JONES, P. & SUTTON, P. 1986. 'Art and Land: Aboriginal Sculptures of the Lake Eyre Region'. (South Australian Museum: Adelaide).

KARPAN, R. & A. 1989. Saskatchewan Indians to tell their own story. Liaison, Winter: 21-23.

KARTINYERI, D., GRZYBOWICZ, N. & CRAIG, B. 1990. The Aboriginal Family History Project at the South Australian Museum. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 23: 12-18.

KOORIE HERITAGE TRUST 1990. Report into the Future Directions of the Koorie Heritage Trust, Melbourne, Victoria.

LAFORET, A. 1992. 'The Book of the Grand Hall', (Canadian Museum of Civilization: Hull, Quebec).

LAMPERT, R. 1983. Physical anthropology collections. Aboriginal remains and the Australian Museum. Bulletin of the Council of Museum Anthropologists, 12:

LANGFORD, R. 1983. Our heritage your playground. Australian Archaeology 16: 1-6.

LENNARD, C. 1990. Warlukurlangu Artists. Artlink 10: 22-23.

LEWIS, D. 1973. Anthropology and colonialism. Current Anthropology 14: 581-602.

LOFGREN, M., & SPECHT, J. 1979. Report on the Steering Committee Meeting of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 3:

MacDONALD, G.F. 1993. Repatriation of First Peoples' collections from Canadian Museums'. Paper presented to Post-Colonial Formations Conference, Griffith University, July.

MAKAGIANSAR, M. 1989. The work of UNESCO. In Prott, L. & Specht, J. (eds) 'Protection or Plunder: Safeguarding the Future of Our Cultural Heritage. Papers of the UNESCO Regional Seminar on the Movable Cultural Property Convention, Brisbane, 1986'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

McCORMACK, P. 1991. Reconstituting A Natoas Bundle: A Provincial Museum of Alberta - Peigan Collaborative Project, paper submitted to the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples. Canadian Museums Association, July.

McKENZIE, P. 1990. From Yuendumu to Paris. Artlink 10: 78-79.

McMaster, G. & Martin, L. (eds) 1992. 'Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives'. (Douglas & McIntyre, Vancouver/Toronto and Canadian Museum of Civilization: Hull).

MEEHAN, B. & BONA, J. 1986. 'National Inventory of Aboriginal Artefacts'. (The Australian Museum: Sydney).

MICHAELS, E. 1987. 'Towards a Cultural Future: Francis Jupurrurla Makes TV at Yuendumu'. (Artspace: Sydney).
    1988. Bad Aboriginal Art, 1988. In Buckley, S., Hardt, M. & Massumi, B. (eds) 'Bad Aboriginal Art, Tradition, Media, and Technological Horizons: Eric Michaels'. Theory Out of Bounds 3: 143-163. (1994) (University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis).

MITTELSTAEDT, M. 1994. Aboriginal medicine to be recognized. The Globe and Mail, 2 November, p. A4.

MOWLJARLAI, D., & PECK, C. 1987. Ngarinyin cultural continuity: a project to teach the young people the culture, including the re-painting of Wandjina rock art sites. Australian Aboriginal Studies 2: 71-78.

MULVANEY, D.J. 1980. The proposed Gallery of Aboriginal Australia. In Edwards, R. & Stewart, J. (eds) 'Preserving Indigenous Cultures: A New Role for Museums'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).
    1991. Past regained, future lost: the Kow Swamp Pleistocene burials. Antiquity 65: 12-21.

MULVANEY, J. 1989. Reflections on the Murray Black Collection. Australian Natural History 23: 66-73.

MUSEUMS IN AUSTRALIA 1975. Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Museums and National Collections' including the Report of the Planning Committee on the Gallery of Aboriginal Australia. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

MUSEUM OF AUSTRALIA INTERIM COUNCIL 1983. 'The Plan for the Development of the Museum of Australia'. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

NEMIROFF, D., HOULE, R. & TOWNSEND-GAULT, C. 1992. 'Land Spirit Power: First Nations at the National Gallery of Canada'. (National Gallery of Canada: Ottawa).

NEW SOUTH WALES GOVERNMENT 1989 'Report of New South Wales Ministerial Task Force on Aboriginal Heritage and Culture 1989'. (Office of Aboriginal Affairs: Sydney).

OODGEROO 1989. 'Towards a Global Village in the Southern Hemisphere'. (Institute for Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University: Brisbane).

PARDOE, C. 1990. Sharing the past: Aboriginal influence on archaeological practice, a case study from New South Wales. Aboriginal History 14: 208-223.
    1991. Eye of the storm. Journal of Indigenous Studies 2: 16-23.

PORTER, C. 1990. The natural history museum. In Shapiro, M.S. (ed.) 'The Museum: A Reference Guide'. (Greenwood Press: New York).

PRESLEY, D., NILSEN, L. & BELL, M. 1993. Indigenous Australian cultural and intellectual properties. Queensland Community Arts Network News, third edition, pp. 36-37.

QUEENSLAND ART GALLERY 1990. 'Balance 1990: Views, Visions and Influences'. (Queensland Art Gallery: Brisbane).

RICHARDSON, B. 1993. 'People of Terra Nullius: Betrayal and Rebirth in Aboriginal Canada'. (Douglas & McIntyre: Vancouver/Toronto).

ROBINS, R. (in press). Australian anthropology and the Queensland Museum — a case for change. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 26:

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY 1990. (Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra).

SAMPSON, C. 1988. Aboriginal keeping places'. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 20: 20-23.

SCULTHORPE, G. 1989. What has Aboriginalisation meant at the Museum of Victoria?. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 22: 17-24.

SMITH, D. 1993. 'The Seventh Fire'. (Berkley Publishing Group: Georgetown, Ontario).

SNOW, E. 1993. Archaeology policy development in Canada: a case study in cultural policy'. Paper presented to Post-Colonial Formations Conference, Griffith University, Brisbane, July.

SPECHT, J. 1978. An Intergovernmental Committee on Restitution or Return of Cultural Property. UNESCO News 29(3): 3-5.
    1979. Anthropology. Pp. 141-49. In Strahan, R. (ed.) 'Rare and Curious Specimens: An Illustrated His-

tory of the Australian Museum 1827-1979'. (The Australian Museum: Sydney).

— 1993. Museums and cultural heritage of the Pacific Islands. In Yen, Ambrose, Jones, Thorne & Andrews (eds) 'A Community of Culture: The People and Prehistory of the Pacific'. Occasional Paper in Prehistory series, no. 22: 266-80. (Department of Prehistory, Research, School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University: Canberra).

SPECHT, J., et al 1991. Working together on issues of access: Indigenous Peoples and the Australian Museum. Pp. 185-88. In 'Something for Everyone: Access to Museums', papers of the 1991 Conference of the Council of Australian Museum Associations, Adelaide.

SPONHOLZ, E. 1988. Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump Interpretive Centre. Muse 6(3): 8-10.

STANNARD, B. 1988. Bones of contention. Pp. 40-44. In The Bulletin, 11 Oct.

STATE OF VICTORIA 1990. 'Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act 1972'. (Victorian Government Printing Office: Melbourne).

STEPHEN, A., PERKINS, H. & MITCHELL, A. 1993. Repatriation, race, representation. Photofile 93(40): 12-18.

STRAHAN, R. 1979. Administrators of rank 1836 - 1860. Pp. 15-22. In Strahan, R. (ed.) 'Rare and Curious Specimens: An Illustrated History of the Australian Museum 1827-1979'. (The Australian Museum: Sydney).

SUTTON, P. (ed.)1988. 'Dreamings: The Art of Aboriginal Australia'. (George Braziller: New York).

— 1990. Dreamings: the story thus far. Bulletin of the Conference of Museum Anthropologists 23: 176-178.

TACON, P. 1993. The Australian Museum's Aboriginal collections today. Muse, April-May: 4, 11.

TATZ, C. 1992. Aboriginality as civilisation. In Whitlock, G. & Carter, D. (eds) 'Images of Australia'. (University of Queensland Press: Brisbane).

TYMCHUK, M. 1985. Museums, anthropology and skeletal remains. The International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship 4: 3389-3394.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA DEPARTMENT FOR THE ARTS 1992. Into the Twenty-first Century. Recommendations of the State Task Force for Museums Policy, Western Australia, Perth.

WHITELY, G.P. 1962. The first hundred years. Australian Natural History 14: 111-115.

CHAPTER 5

MUSEUMS: ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION

ROBIN TROTTER

INTRODUCTION

The foregoing chapters have focused on the relationship between museums and communities or segments of the population. This chapter turns to a more general aspect of the relations between museums and their communities in considering questions of access and participation. These concerns have become a topic of debate since the 1960s at all levels inside and outside museums. The main factors prompting this have been the increasing importance of localism in museum affairs, increasing demands for public accountability in the administration of museums and a broadening of the notion of cultural heritage.

LOCALISM

A powerful impact on museums has been the concept of community empowerment and community-centred approaches to culture, power, and citizenship rights. In the last decade we have seen a re-emergence of concerns about localism, regionalism and particularism; concerns that are closely linked to questions about multiculturalism and communitarianism. It is a trend that often runs counter to increasing nationalism and the growing globalisation of economic relationships (Galla, 1993). In a polemic for local arts, Michael Bogle appealed for greater attention to regional strategies, which would, he argues, result in a decentralisation and de-specialisation of collecting policies, encourage greater community participation, and restore a sense of community (1988: 80). Bogle draws on Lewis Mumford's theory of regionalism in which regionalism is defined as 'the adoption of goals that benefit, support or reinforce regional values' (Mumford, 1938). He goes on to argue that when there is a strong sense of national identity, as there is in Australia, regionalism is not a political threat. Rather, he suggests, it 'can push through national uniformities and assume great importance. Although largely unarticulated, regional differences in Australia are often perceived by the public to be of great interest'. He suggests there are two forms of regionalism — 'geographic regionalism' based on political boundaries of administration and 'cultural regionalism' based on

the revival of vernacular language, literature, and a sense of common identities and values. He envisages the role of museums primarily in terms of cultural regionalism:

> Galleries should be at the centre of cultural regionalism because they can provide the focus for 'cultural memory', thus ensuring that each local generation has the opportunity to investigate and reassess its artistic past. ... The community roles of regional galleries have largely imparted national values in the arts and crafts and provided venues for travelling exhibitions. The result is that the preservation, investigation and dissemination of regional values have been neglected. Yet this is where Australia's cultural needs are greatest. If regionalism were adopted, it would involve the complete arts and crafts community and this emphasis would encourage the 'arts ecology' so vital to regional success. (Bogle, 1988: 72-80).

Although Bogle is speaking specifically of arts activities, his comments apply equally to artefact collections held by community museums and the historical work undertaken by these and similar organisations.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

Alongside new demands from diverse communities for access and participation in cultural activities there are increasing governmental demands for greater public accountability in the administration of museums. As museum visitation numbers grow, museums promote themselves more extensively and operating costs increase, questions of control, and accountability, become public and political issues. Previous government policies of maintaining such institutions 'at arms length' are being challenged.

In this context, the Department of Finance Discussion Paper, *What Price Heritage?*, demonstrated this shift toward a more interventionist role for government in the cultural arena. The discussion revolved around the concept of a 'public-private' benefits model, where 'public-good benefits' were defined as those 'which accrue to the population generally whether or not individuals participate first-hand as consumers of heritage activity and enjoyment of which cannot be restricted to specific groups', and where 'private-good benefits' were described as those 'enjoyed more or less exclusively' which can be 'assigned to specific individuals or groups and which in some form or other can be marketed' (Department of Finance, 1989: 26, 27). The dis-